

SEP 18 1926

RECEIVED

37/3

THE

Massachusetts Quarterly

REVIEW.

NO. 1. — DECEMBER, 1847.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I. THE AMERICAN WAR.	1
II. THE GREEK SLAVE.	54
III. THE POLITICAL CONDITION AND PROSPECTS OF GREECE.	95
IV. THE REVIEWS AND HISTORY.	120

BOSTON.

JOHN COOLIDGE & WILBY,

No. 12 Water Street.

PRINTED BY CHAS. H. CHAMBERLAIN, 100 CORNHILL.

UNIVERSAL HISTORY,

From the Creation of the World to the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century. By the late Hon. **ALEX. FRASER TYTLER**, Lord Woodhouselee, Senator of the College of Justice, and Lord Commissioner of Justiciary in Scotland, and formerly Professor of Civil History and Greek and Roman Antiquities in the University of Edinburgh.

This Work contains the whole course of Lectures on Universal History, delivered by the Professor, while engaged in the University of Edinburgh, and has been for many years and now is a text-book in the first Universities of both countries, and in all probability will be handed down to the end of time, as the most interesting and useful work on Universal History for the time it embraces, extant.

The chief characteristic feature of the plan of the author is, that he rejects the popular style of historians of arranging general history according to certain epochs or eras, and proceeds to give the history of a nation or people through a long succession of years, digressing only when the history of some other nation may be so interwoven with the one under consideration as to become inseparable. In this way the author gives the history of the world from the creation, compiled from the best authorities, with great simplicity and perspicuity; and his work cannot fail to recommend itself to the professional man, the student, and the general reader.

The present edition is comprised in two handsomely printed octavo volumes of 1000 pages, neatly bound, and is offered at the low price of Three Dollars. A liberal discount made to those buying to sell again, or to teachers buying for their schools. All orders by mail, post-paid, promptly attended to.

THOMAS WILEY, JR.

20 State Street, Boston, Publisher and Bookseller.

BOOKS & STATIONERY.

T. WILEY, JR.'S

BOOKSTORE, 20 STATE STREET,

Where may be found a complete assortment of the popular works of the day, including as well as all the **NOVELS, ROMANCES, TALES, MAGAZINES**, and like works, all new publications of a higher order, whether *Literary, Scientific, or Miscellaneous*. You may depend upon having your orders supplied, if you will send for any works by whomsoever advertised or published; our arrangements with publishers secure promptness. Also, elegantly illustrated **GIFT BOOKS**, and a large assortment of **BOOKS FOR CHILDREN**, which will be sold at the smallest possible advance upon the cost.

SUBSCRIPTIONS received to all the **PERIODICALS** of the day, and sent to any part of the city or country soon as published. Our long and extensive experience in this department gives us facilities possessed by no other house in New England. Our endeavour is to make our Establishment complete for supplying all **BOOKS, CHEAP PUBLICATIONS, MAGAZINES**, published in this country, or England, and by attention to business, to give the greatest satisfaction.

T. WILEY, JR.

20 State Street.

MASSACHUSETTS QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. I.—DECEMBER, 1847.

TO THE PUBLIC.

THE American people are fast opening their own destiny. Their material basis is of such extent that no folly of man can quite subvert it; for the territory is a considerable fraction of the planet, and the population neither loath nor inexpert to use their advantages. Add, that this energetic race derive an unprecedented material power from the new arts, from the expansions effected by public schools, cheap postage, and a cheap press, from the telescope, the telegraph, the railroad, steamship, steamferry, steammill, from domestic architecture, chemical agriculture, from ventilation, from ice, ether, caoutchouc, and innumerable inventions and manufactures.

A scholar who has been reading of the fabulous magnificence of Assyria and Persia, of Rome and Constantinople, leaves his library, and takes his seat in a rail-car, where he is importuned by newsboys with journals still wet from Liverpool and Havre, with telegraphic despatches not yet fifty minutes old from Buffalo and Cincinnati. At the screams of the steam-whistle, the train quits city and suburbs, darts away into the interior,—drops every man at his estate as it whirls along, and shows our traveller what tens of thousands of powerful and weaponed men, science-armed and society-armed, sit at large in this ample region, obscure from their numbers and the extent of the domain. He reflects on the power

which each of these plain republicans can employ ; how far these chains of intercourse and travel reach, interlock, and ramify ; what levers, what pumps, what exhaustive analyses are applied to nature for the benefit of masses of men. Then he exclaims, What a negro-fine royalty is that of Jamschid and Solomon ! What a substantial sovereignty does my townsman possess ! A man who has a hundred dollars to dispose of, — a hundred dollars over his bread, — is rich beyond the dreams of the Cæsars.

Keep our eyes as long as we can on this picture, we cannot stave off the ulterior question, — the famous question of Cineas to Pyrrhus, — the *WHERE*TO of all this power and population, these surveys and inventions, this taxing and tabulating, mill-privilege, roads, and mines. The aspect this country presents is a certain maniacal activity, an immense apparatus of cunning machinery which turns out, at last, some Nuremberg toys. Has it generated, as great interests do, any intellectual power ? Where are the works of the "imagination" — the surest test of a national genius ? At least as far as the purpose and genius of America is yet reported in any book, it is a sterility, and no genius.

One would say, there is nothing colossal in the country but its geography and its material activities ; that the moral and intellectual effects are not on the same scale with the trade and production. There is no speech heard but that of auctioneers, newsboys, and the caucus. Where is the great breath of the New World, the voice of aboriginal nations opening new eras with hymns of lofty cheer ? Our books and fine arts are imitations ; there is a fatal incuriosity and disinclination in our educated men to new studies, and the interrogation of nature. We have taste, critical talent, good professors, good commentators, but a lack of male energy.

What more serious calamity can befall a people than a constitutional dulness and limitation ? The moral influence of the intellect is wanting. We hearken in vain for any profound

voice speaking to the American heart, cheering timid good men, animating the youth, consoling the defeated, and intelligently announcing duties which clothe life with joy, and endear the face of land and sea to men. It is a poor consideration that the country wit is precocious, and, as we say, practical; that political interests on so broad a scale as ours are administered by little men with some saucy village talent, by deft partisans, good cipherers, strict economists, quite empty of all superstition.

Conceding these unfavorable appearances, it would yet be a poor pedantry to read the fates of this country from these narrow data. On the contrary, we are persuaded that moral and material values are always commensurate. Every material organization exists to a moral end, which makes the reason of its existence. Here are no books, but who can see the continent with its inland and surrounding waters, its temperate climates, its west-wind breathing vigor through all the year, its confluence of races so favorable to the highest energy, and the infinite glut of their production, without putting new queries to Destiny, as to the purpose for which this muster of nations and this sudden creation of enormous values is made.

This is equally the view of science and of patriotism. We hesitate to employ a word so much abused as *patriotism*, whose true sense is almost the reverse of its popular sense. We have no sympathy with that boyish egotism hoarse with cheering for our side, for our State, for our town; the right patriotism consists in the delight which springs from contributing our peculiar and legitimate advantages to the benefit of humanity. Every foot of soil has its proper quality; the grape on two sides of the same fence has new flavors; and so every acre on the globe, every family of men, every point of climate, has its distinguishing virtues. Certainly, then, this country does not lie here in the sun causeless; and though it may not be easy to define its influence, men feel already its emancipating quality in the careless self-reliance of the manners, in the

freedom of thought, in the direct roads by which grievances are reached and redressed, and even in the reckless and sinister politics, not less than in purer expressions. Bad as it is, this freedom leads onward and upward—to a Columbia of thought and art, which is the last and endless end of Columbus's adventure.

Lovers of our country, but not always approvers of the public counsels, we should certainly be glad to give good advice in politics. We have not been able to escape our national and endemic habit, and to be liberated from interest in the elections and in public affairs. Nor have we cared to disfranchise ourselves. We are more solicitous than others to make our politics clear and healthful, as we believe politics to be nowise accidental or exceptional, but subject to the same laws with trees, earths, and acids.

We see that reckless and destructive fury which characterizes the lower classes of American society, and which is pampered by hundreds of profligate presses. The young intriguers who drive in bar-rooms and town-meetings the trade of politics, sagacious only to seize the victorious side, have put the country into the position of an overgrown bully, and Massachusetts finds no heart or head to give weight and efficacy to her contrary judgment. In hours when it seemed only to need one just word from a man of honor to have vindicated the rights of millions, and to have given a true direction to the first steps of a nation, we have seen the best understandings of New England, the trusted leaders of her counsels constituting a snivelling and despised opposition, clapped on the back by comfortable capitalists from all sections, and persuaded to say, We are too old to stand for what is called a New England sentiment any longer. Rely on us for commercial representatives, but for questions of ethics—who knows what markets may be opened? We are not well, we are not in our seats, when justice and humanity are to be spoken for.

We have a bad war, many victories—each of which converts

the country into an immense chancery ;— and a very insincere political opposition. The country needs to be extricated from its delirium at once. Public affairs are chained in the same law with private ; the retributions of armed states are not less sure and signal than those which come to private felons. The facility of majorities is no protection from the natural sequence of their own acts. Men reason badly, but nature and destiny are logical.

But whilst we should think our pains well bestowed if we could cure the infatuation of statesmen, and should be sincerely pleased if we could give a direction to the federal politics, we are far from believing politics the primal interest of men. On the contrary, we hold that laws and governors cannot possess a commanding interest for any but vacant or fanatical people : for the reason that this is simply a formal and superficial interest ; and men of a solid genius are only interested in substantial things.

The state, like the individual, should rest on an ideal basis. Not only man but nature is injured by the imputation that man exists only to be fattened with bread ; but he lives in such connection with Thought and Fact, that his bread is surely involved as one element thereof, but is not its end and aim. So the insight which commands the laws and conditions of the true polity, precludes forever all interest in the squabbles of parties. As soon as men have tasted the enjoyments of learning, friendship, and virtue, for which the state exists, the prizes of office appear polluted, and their followers, outcasts.

A journal that would meet the real wants of this time must have a courage and power sufficient to solve the problems which the great groping society around us, stupid with perplexity, is dumbly exploring. Let it not show its astuteness, by dodging each difficult question, and arguing diffusely every point on which men are long ago unanimous. Can it front this matter of Socialism, to which the names of Owen and Fourier have attached, and dispose of that question ? Will it

cope with the allied questions of Government, Nonresistance, and all that belongs under that category? Will it measure itself with the chapter of Slavery, in some sort the special enigma of the time, as it has provoked against it a sort of inspiration and enthusiasm singular in modern history? There are literary and philosophical reputations to settle. The name of Swedenborg has in this very time acquired new honors, and the current year has witnessed the appearance, in their first English translation, of his manuscripts. Here is an unsettled account in the book of Fame; a nebula to dim eyes, but which great telescopes may yet resolve into a magnificent system. Here is the standing problem of Natural Science, and the merits of her great interpreters, to be determined; the encyclopedical Humboldt, and the intrepid generalizations collected by the author of the "Vestiges of Creation." Here is the balance to be adjusted between the exact French school of Cuvier, and the genial catholic theorists, Geoffroy St. Hilaire, Goethe, Davy, and Agassiz. Will it venture into the thin and difficult air of that school where the secrets of structure are discussed under the topics of mesmerism and the twilights of demonology?

What will easily seem to many a far higher question than any other is that which respects the embodying of the Conscience of the Period. Is the age we live in unfriendly to the highest powers; to that blending of the affections with the poetic faculty which has distinguished the Religious Ages? We have a better opinion of the economy of nature than to fear that those varying phases which humanity presents, ever leave out any of the grand springs of human action. Mankind for the moment seem to be in search of a religion. The Jewish *cultus* is declining; the Divine, or, as some will say, the truly Human, hovers, now seen, now unseen, before us. This period of peace, this hour when the jangle of contending churches is hushing or hushed, will seem only the more propitious to those who believe that man need not fear the want of religion, be-

cause they know his religious constitution,—that he must rest on the moral and religious sentiments, as the motion of bodies rests on geometry. In the rapid decay of what was called religion, timid and unthinking people fancy a decay of the hope of man. But the moral and religious sentiments meet us everywhere, alike in markets as in churches. A God starts up behind cotton bales also. The conscience of man is regenerated as is the atmosphere, so that society cannot be debauched. That health which we call Virtue is an equipoise which easily redresses itself, and resembles those rocking-stones which a child's finger can move, and a weight of many hundred tons cannot overthrow.

With these convictions, a few friends of good letters have thought fit to associate themselves for the conduct of a new journal. We have obeyed the custom and convenience of the time in adopting this form of a Review, as a mould into which all metal most easily runs. But the form shall not be suffered to be an impediment. The name might convey the impression of a book of criticism, and that nothing is to be found here which was not written expressly for the Review; but good readers know that inspired pages are not written to fill a space, but for inevitable utterance; and to such our journal is freely and solicitously open, even though every thing else be excluded. We entreat the aid of every lover of truth and right, and let these principles entreat for us. We rely on the talents and industry of good men known to us, but much more on the magnetism of truth, which is multiplying and educating advocates for itself and friends for us. We rely on the truth for and against ourselves.

ART. I. — *Message from the President of the United States to the two Houses of Congress, at the commencement of the Second Session of the Twenty-ninth Congress, Dec. 8th, 1846. Washington. 1846.*

THERE is a period in history when war is thought to be the natural state of mankind ; when, certainly, it is the common state, and peace an exception to the general rule. Labor is hated, and war honored. In such a time, no reason need be given for going to war ; rather perhaps is a reason required for ceasing from battle and plunder. In the early period of Rome, the senate now and then made a truce, but never a peace. Peace was only an armistice for a limited period. Says Homer, " It is the business of a man to fight ; of a slave to till the ground." He represented the general opinion of the " Heroic Age." But now things are somewhat changed. War is the exception ; public opinion is against it. Merchants and mechanics dislike it, for it interferes with their productive operations ; thinking men abhor it as unreasonable ; and good men look on it as wicked. In all European countries, the thinking men demand of their rulers a good reason for disturbing their relations of peace. The old talk about national honor has diminished not a little amongst intelligent men, who think the national honor which is gained or lost by a battle is of no great value. Indeed, so far have matters gone, that many men hold the opinion, and some have even a sober and settled conviction, that war between nations is no more reputable and manly, no more likely to establish justice, than trial by battle in courts of law ; no better than duelling between " men of honor," or a bout with fists between two Irish beggars partially drunken. They think that war is nothing but murder, murder in the first degree, with malice aforethought, and what is wrong for one man is equally wrong for twenty millions — that injustice is not the less so for being a great injustice. Then again there are some religious men who think that Christianity actually forbids war. It is true the various churches of the world have taken little pains to say so, but a good deal of pains to say the opposite. We never yet have seen the creed, the litany, or the catechism, which gave us the smallest hint that Christianity and war were incompatible. Still there are religious men who think the religion of which

God planted the germs in human nature, is thoroughly hostile to all war.

All of these men united may be few in number — Theorists, Philanthropists, Philosophers, and the like. Still they are not idle nor ineffective ; they have already produced a change in public opinion ; and in this city and its neighbourhood, a very great change within a few years. Then, too, there are sound, sober, practical men, who look little at first principles, it may be, and the nature of things, but much at modes of operation, and effects. They see that war is costly ; that it costs money ; that it costs men ; that it is not productive. In short, they see that all which a nation consumes in its army and navy is a bad investment, stock which does not pay. Still further : there are humane men, aboriginal democrats, who think that Man is of more account than the Accidents of a man — customs, institutions, property, and the like ; they think that all government should be designed for the good of all men, and therefore that it must accord with the principles of absolute justice, which God has written on the heart of mankind. They see that war tramples all these principles under foot, and therefore, and in the name of the people, they obstinately refuse to promote, to favor, or even to tolerate a war.

Now, by means of these small parties of original thinkers, the Theorists, Philosophers, the Economists, and the Philanthropists, it has come to pass that war is getting sadly out of favor. True there are men, and enough of them, in the name of Religion, of Philosophy, Economy, and Democracy, who defend the old usage. They think that war now and then is a good thing ; “ it invigorates the people ” — “ it kills off the rabble, and, for the latter purpose, is better than the jail and gallows, as well as swifter.” These men have a great many newspapers at their command, and sometimes occupy seats deemed more sacred than an editor’s chair. Doubtless they retard the progress of true ideas, and so add to the misery of mankind. Yet they no longer govern public opinion ; their influence yearly becomes less, for man naturally loves justice, and is a human being, not a brute, nor a fool. It has now come to pass, that in all civilized countries the mass of men look on war as a terrible evil, and one not to be lightly incurred by the government of the nation.

It surprises no one when two savage tribes quarrel ; the cause is seldom inquired after, for it is known that in such a stage of progress war is to be looked for and expected. But

when a civilized nation pauses in its career of productive exertions, and, turning its art, its science, its strength of hand and head, its natural activity, from their creative work, seeks to destroy the property of its sister State, to burn her towns, to butcher her men, and with the soldier's invading foot pollute her soil—it is a serious and a dreadful thing. Sober men look for the cause of such madness. The physical evil is monstrous—the waste of property, the havoc of life. But this is the smallest part of the mischief. The savage spirit excited in the soldier, which he carries home to his village; the hunger after booty, the thirst of blood, which successful war wakens in the conqueror's throat; the desire of revenge which defeat kindles in the heart of the discomfited,—these long retard the progress of mankind. Take the foremost of civilized nations: the mass of men have not yet forgotten the savage; the thin garment of civilization is easily torn asunder and stripped off; you break the skin of the gentleman and behold a cannibal; the peasant of England or France becomes the fierce Saxon, or the savage Gaul, whose deeds you shudder to think of.

Every war in this age retards the progress of mankind. The United States, having outgrown their mother, refused her burthens, resisted her stripes, and at last separated from her, after a long and hearty quarrel. The effects of that quarrel still survive, and centuries of peace will hardly remove the jealousy and hatred felt by the most ignorant men of both nations, as well as by their political leaders. If two countries are united by a war, as Poland and Russia, the spirit of intense and national hatred remains yet longer, and is still more violent.

It is a great wrong for a powerful and civilized people to attack a nation that is barbarous and feeble. The indignation of honest statesmen is justly aroused against France for her conduct towards Algiers. Doubtless she had her provocations, but between the Weak and the Strong every body knows where the provocation commonly begins. The old fable of the wolf and the lamb is not likely to be forgotten. The conduct of England towards the various nations in India, towards China, towards Ireland—fills the world with indignation. The history of her achievements in Asia is the history of her shame. Honest men in England know it as well as we. Austria is powerful and Rome is weak; the emperor is of the middle ages, while the new pope is a son of the nineteenth century,

and of course a reformer. He loves his church, loves his people, loves mankind ; founds institutions which the Austrian despot cannot relish, or even tolerate ; which endanger the "peculiar institutions" of that despotic monarch. The middle ages and the nineteenth century are mutually hostile. Institutions which ought to be separated by hundreds of years quarrel at first touch. If Ferdinand should therefore invade the States of the Church, attempting to re-annex the March of Ancona to his possessions in Lombardy—the advance from Ferrara to Bologna would raise a cry of shame in every country of Europe, and find a manly echo even in America. Justice takes sides with the party most in the right ; Humanity against the strong oppressor.

The present war against Mexico is entitled to a serious examination. The Mexicans are few, poor, weak, half-civilized ; they lack the elements which give a people strength. They have no national unity of action. Imitating the example of the United States, they separated from the mother country, and tried the experiment of a liberal constitution. They have been in a quarrel among themselves ever since, and have perhaps shown themselves unfit for a republican government. The people cannot go alone ; they are weak, distracted, inefficient, but possessed of a wide and rich territory, valuable and attractive. The Americans are numerous, patriotic, enterprising, hardy, united, and of course powerful,—the most energetic and executive nation ever developed on the earth. Besides this, they have established a form of government which harmoniously balances individual freedom with national unity of action ; a government which of all others is the best fitted to develop energy, hardihood, and enterprise ; one most powerful of all to direct and animate a conquering army. We know this is not the common opinion, but the military man who is also a statesman, and familiar with the history of States—if such a military man can be found amongst us—will see the truth of this judgment.

The strong nation is at war with the weak. America has the example of France and England to sustain her, and other examples not quite so reputable, but which shall presently be cited. No doubt the English nation—we mean the portion thereof who trade in politics, on the one extreme, and, on the other, the brute portion of the people—would justify the American invasion of Mexico ; would think more highly of

us for the undertaking, and the success of it. It is plainly following the example of England herself—a copy of her treatment of the Irishman and the East Indian. Here, too, the men who trade in politics and the brute portion of the people like the war. It matters not which party they belong to; they call it patriotic; they go for the country however bounded, and the country right or wrong. Before such men we lay our finger on our lips, and say nothing. Let Time teach them.

But there is another body of men in all lands, and powerful in this—Philosophers, Economists, Philanthropists, who are not satisfied with a war merely because they are engaged in it; who think it no better because waged against a miserable opponent, or because it is fought by their own country; who know that successful wrong is no better than when defeated. To such men it is necessary to offer a reason for disturbing the peace of the continent. The President of the United States, in his message at the opening of the second session of the last Congress, has himself undertaken to justify the war. In his statement there is a certain doubleness of purpose quite apparent. He makes a special plea, with a compound issue, thus:—The Mexicans began the war, and we acted only on the defensive; but then there were a great many reasons why we might ourselves have begun the war, without waiting for the Mexicans to take the initiative. Thus is he doubly armed. If the major weapon of argument fail—and it is shown that the Mexicans did not commence the war—then he holds fast by the minor, that we had a just reason for beginning it ourselves. But let us examine this matter more nicely. We extract from Mr. Polk's message of Dec. 8th, 1846. The italics are our own.

“Such has been our scrupulous adherence to the dictates of justice, in all our foreign intercourse, that we have given no just cause of complaint to any nation, and have enjoyed the blessings of peace for more than thirty years. *From a policy so sacred to humanity we should never be induced voluntarily to depart.*” But “*Mexico commenced hostilities, and forced the war upon us.*”—p. 3.

But even if it were not so, “long before the advance of our army to the left bank of the Río Grande, we had ample cause of war against Mexico.” But some, he adds, have represented the war “as unjust and unnecessary, and as one of aggression on our part upon a weak and injured enemy. Such erroneous views,

though entertained by but few, have been widely and extensively circulated, not only at home, but have been spread throughout Mexico and the whole world. *A more effectual means could not have been devised to encourage the enemy and protract the war, than to advocate and adhere to their cause, and thus give them 'aid and comfort.'*" — p. 4.

This reminds us of what George III. said to the lord mayor of London, in 1775. "It is with the utmost astonishment that I find any of my subjects capable of encouraging the rebellious disposition that unhappily exists in some of my colonies in North America." Some of the subjects, however, did continue to advocate and adhere to the cause of the rebels, affording them aid and comfort. The king thought it was moral treason, a protracting of the war. They had truth and justice on their side, and against them — King George the Third.

Mr. Polk proceeds to state the case of America against Mexico. The Americans had suffered many grievances from the Mexicans. "The wrongs we have suffered from Mexico, almost ever since she became an independent power, and the patient endurance with which we have borne them, are without a parallel in the history of modern civilized nations." Soon after her independence, she commenced "a system of insult and spoliation;" "our citizens employed in lawful commerce were imprisoned, their vessels seized, our flag insulted in her ports." Change of rulers brought no change in this system, continues the President; the American government made repeated reclamations, which were followed only by new outrages; promises of redress were postponed or evaded. The commercial treaty of 1831 produced no change. In 1837, General Jackson declared that such conduct "would justify in all nations immediate war." Yet he thought we should give Mexico one more opportunity to atone for the past before we resorted to war. Accordingly, negotiations were entered into in 1837, and the Mexican government promised to do all which reason or justice required. This was in July, but in December the promise had not been fulfilled. Mr. Polk distinctly declares, "*had the United States at that time adopted compulsory measures and taken redress into their own hands, all our difficulties with Mexico would probably have been long since adjusted, and the existing war have been avoided.*" — p. 7.

This is a plain statement. But if the *Mexicans began the war in 1846*, because the Americans annexed Texas, we can-

not see how any one act of the Americans in 1837 could have prevented it, unless indeed Mexico had been so weakened as to be unable to wage a war! But the President does not see that he is tacitly admitting that the Mexicans did *not* begin this war, all of whose causes we are to seek previous to 1837. A compound issue is a difficult one to plead. We beg the reader to notice that the President admits that the causes of the Mexican war — the seizure of American property and men, insults to our flag — are all anterior to the year 1837, and might have been disposed of then, if we had then sought redress in the usual way — by war. Of course all that has occurred since can be but accessory after the fact!

But a new negotiation was begun; the convention of April 12th, 1839, took place — this was the first convention. In August, 1840, a Board of Commissioners, with powers limited to eighteen months, was organized to adjust the claims of American citizens against Mexico. An umpire, appointed by the king of Prussia, came to assist in the work.* The Board allowed American claims to the amount of \$2,026,139.68; the American commissioners allowed also \$928,627.88, which the Mexican commissioners had not time to examine. Thus there was a total of \$2,954,767.56, which the American commissioners demanded of Mexico. Other claims, amounting to \$3,336,837.05, were also presented, which the American commissioners had not decided upon when their period of service came to an end. Mexico acknowledged her obligation to pay the \$2,026,139.68, but, unable to pay immediately, asked for more time.

A second convention took place January 30th, 1843, and an agreement was made that the interest due on the acknowledged claims should be paid on the 30th of the next April, and the residue of principal and interest in twenty instalments, one payable each three months. The interest was paid and three of the instalments, as they severally became due, though we are told, such was the poverty of the Mexican government, that some of the money could only be raised by forced loans.

On the 20th of November, 1843, a third convention was concluded upon by the Mexican government, for the purpose of ascertaining and settling all other claims not previously

* The character of these claims and the gross imposture of many of the claimants were well exposed by Mr. J. S. Pendleton, a member from Virginia, in a speech, Feb. 22, 1847.

adjusted by the first convention, in 1839. The American authorities offered some amendments to the Mexican scheme, which it seems the Mexican government did not accede to, and so the convention never took place.*

In brief, then, letting alone the insults offered to our flag — and we know not how they can be shaken out of its folds — this is the sum of actual and tangible grievances. Mexico owes us about \$2,000,000, and does not pay. The President thinks war ought to have been declared long ago.

“In so long suffering Mexico to violate her most solemn treaty obligations, plunder our citizens of their property, and imprison their persons without affording them any redress, we have failed to perform one of the first and highest duties which every government owes to its citizens. *We had ample cause of war against Mexico long before the breaking out of hostilities. But even then [it is doubtful to what time then refers] we forbore to take redress into our own hands, until Mexico herself became the aggressor, by invading our soil in hostile array and shedding the blood of our citizens. Such are the grave causes of complaint against Mexico.*” — *Message of 1846, p. 9.*

We do not by any means approve of the whole conduct of Mexico in her dealings with America, but there were many circumstances which palliated that conduct. She did not pay the money, for she had no money to pay with, and no credit to borrow with. In 1845, Mr. Slidell wrote to the American government that her “finances are in a condition utterly desperate. The amount of public debt does not fall much short of \$150,000,000,” and interest was paid on but a small part of it. Is it a thing unheard of for one State to delay paying the claims of another — unheard of to wait a long time before such a payment? The government of Bavaria has a large claim on the government of France — a very just claim too, as it seems to us — pending at this moment. The King of the French can pay it, but does not. How long did America wait for the payment of her French claims, and her Neapolitan claims? Nay, how long has the State of Massachusetts waited for the payment of her claims against this

* For official accounts of these matters, see Mr. Polk's message of Dec. 2d, 1845; of December 8, 1846; Mr. C. J. Ingersoll's report on the war with Mexico, June 24, 1846, with Mr. Howard's report, July 7th, 1838, and the minority report of Mr. Cushing, of the same date. — Doc. No. 752. Ho. of Rep., 29th Congress, 1st Session. See the usual commentaries in the speeches of the times.

very American government, which in 1837 *ought* to have taken her Mexican sister by the throat, and sold all that she had, that payment might be made, and promptly too? The President is not very desirous to pay the claims which American citizens had against France prior to 1800, though the American government itself owes the money to her own citizens. Mr. Polk himself, by his veto, forbade the payment, after Congress had appropriated the funds. If Mexico had been able and would not pay, the case would have been quite different.

We have seen now "the grave causes of complaint"—"the ample causes of war"—"the wrongs which we have suffered"—"without a parallel in the history of modern civilized nations." Let us now come to the smaller matters, the minor grievances. We must go a little into the history of the times. In 1845, the formalities were completed for the annexation of Texas to the United States. The causes of annexation are well known,—the South did not wish a non-slaveholding State on the southwestern frontier. The economical, the moral, the political effect of such a State was clearly foreseen. The Institution of Slavery was in danger. It seems to be thought by some, that while Slavery stands, the South will stand, when Slavery falls, the South will fall, and then the North, the Union, Freedom, and the Rights of Man. The method by which annexation was brought about is also pretty well known,—the machinations of the great southern politicians, the tameness, the servility, the stupidity of many of the northern members of Congress. All this is well known, but getting better known. The recent letters of Mr. Houston, Mr. Tyler, and Mr. Spencer, shed some light on the matter. When the political excitement of our day has passed by, and some future historian of Democracy in America studies the subject afresh, and with impartial eyes, he will write in sadness a dark chapter. We know not which he will blame most bitterly, the Democrats or the Whigs; but perhaps the latter, as apparently acting against their convictions and without faith. The effects of that annexation will appear in due time, and may be a little different from what the annexers intended.

Mexico claimed Texas, but offered to recognize her independence and abandon her claim, on condition that Texas would not annex herself to America. There was a nominal war between Texas and Mexico, not a war *de facto*, but *de jure*.

The accident follows the substance; when America took Texas it was for better or worse. She took her war along with her — the war *de jure*, though not at that time *de facto*. Mexico protested against annexation as an “act of aggression the most unjust which can be found recorded in the annals of modern history, — despoiling a friendly nation of a considerable portion of her territory,” and on the 6th of March, 1845, her minister demanded his passports, and all regular diplomatic intercourse came abruptly and formally to an end.

Now in 1836, General Jackson thought it a delicate matter to recognize the independence of Texas, and said in his message —

“The acknowledgment of a new State as independent *is at all times an act of great delicacy and responsibility*; but more especially so when such a State has forcibly separated itself from another, which still claims dominion over it. *A premature recognition under these circumstances, if not looked upon as justifiable cause of war, is always liable to be looked upon as proof of an unfriendly spirit to one of the contending parties.*” But in all former cases, “so wisely consistent with our just principles has been the action of our government, that we have under the most critical circumstances, avoided all censure, and encountered no other evil than that produced by a transient estrangement of good will in those against whom we have by force of evidence been compelled to decide.” “The uniform policy and practice of the United States is to avoid all interference in disputes which merely relate to the internal government of other nations, and constantly to recognize the authority of the prevailing party, *without reference to our particular interests and views, or to the merits of the original controversy.*” He considers the power of recognizing the independence of a new State as “*equivalent under some circumstances to a declaration of war.* It will always be considered most . . . safe that it should be exercised, when probably leading to war, with the previous understanding of that body by whom war can alone be declared.” — *Jackson's Message*, Dec. 21st, 1836.

When France acknowledged the independence of the United States in 1778, the English government considered the acknowledgment an unjustifiable aggression. No publicist, we think, would doubt, that if France had then annexed the United States to herself, the annexation offered a just ground for the declaration of war on the part of England. But Mexico did not declare war against America, in 1845; she made no preparations for war. She only protested, and de-

clined further diplomatic intercourse. Had Mexico been as powerful as England, the affair of annexation would not have been disposed of so easily. But Mexico was distracted and weak.

Another alleged offence committed on the part of Mexico, is her refusal to receive the American plenipotentiary, Mr. Slidell. Here are the facts in the case, as the President states them: On the 15th of September, 1845, the American consul at the city of Mexico was instructed by his government "to ascertain from the Mexican government whether they would receive an envoy from the United States intrusted with full power to adjust all the questions in dispute between the two governments." On the 15th of October, the Mexican government assented. The assent was made known to the American government on the 9th of November, and the next day Mr. Slidell was appointed "envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, with full powers to adjust and definitely settle, all pending differences between the two countries, including those of boundary between Mexico and the State of Texas."*

He reached Vera Cruz on the 29th of November, and Mexico on the 6th of December, 1845. But the government of President Herrera — who had seemed desirous of settling the difficulties by peaceful negotiation — was tottering. General Paredes, a military man, had thrown the country into confusion, and declared against receiving a minister of peace from the United States. The Mexican government was alarmed, and refused to receive Mr. Slidell, on the ground that America had not sent the envoy on "a special mission confined to the question of Texas alone," but had given him the general powers already mentioned. The 30th of December, Paredes himself came into power, "a military usurper, who was known to be bitterly hostile to the United States." On the 1st of March, 1846, Mr. Slidell presented his credentials to the new government, desiring to be accredited in the regular manner; on the 12th, the request was finally rejected, and he soon returned home.

"Thus," says the President, "was the extraordinary spectacle presented to the civilized world, of a government in violation of its own express agreement, having twice rejected a minister of

* Mr. Polk's first Message, p. 8.

peace, invested with full powers to adjust all the existing differences between the two countries, in a manner just and honorable to both. I am not aware that modern history presents a parallel case, in which, in time of peace, one nation has refused even to hear propositions from another for terminating existing difficulties between them."—p. 19.

Mr. Polk must be a forgetful politician not to remember that the court of France rejected Mr. Pinckney in 1797, and actually expelled him from their territory. Yet Mr. Pinckney was not altogether like "one of the most illustrious citizens of Louisiana," but a man well known for his public services; "A character," says Mr. Adams, once his rival, "whose integrity, talents, and services placed him in the rank of the most esteemed and respected in the nation."* The insult then offered to America by the French "Executive Directory," in the most public and official manner, is certainly no "parallel" to the conduct of Mexico. To make that insult yet keener, the Directory informed Mr. Monroe—the former minister, who had been recalled, but was still residing at Paris—that they "will not receive another minister plenipotentiary from the United States until the grievances of which France has complained have been redressed." "The Executive Directory know of no minister plenipotentiary from the United States," said they. Yet the burthen of grievances had been created by France. America had endured most astonishing outrages, as well as insults,† which nothing but a remembrance of her timely aid in '78 and her continued help in the remaining portion of the war of our revolution, enabled the nation to endure.

But what said the Republican party? Did they maintain that the dignity of the nation was insulted? did they insist that we must go to war to wipe off the stain, because the French did not pay our just demands, and because a minister had been ignominiously expelled from the French soil? We are sorry to recall old animosities—and will pass over the matter with all possible briefness and delicacy. The conduct of that party is well known; their apology for the conduct of

* Message to 5th Congress—Special Session—May 16th, 1797.

† See the Reports of Messrs. Randolph and Pickering on the French depredations upon American commerce, in American State Papers, Class I. Foreign Relations, Vol. I. p. 424, et seq., p. 748, et seq., and Vol. II. p. 28, et seq., p. 116, et seq., et al. The whole history of these troubles has now become interesting once more. See Vol. II. p. 5–244.

the Directory. But America did not declare war. It was proposed by the party hostile to the administration, that an extraordinary minister suiting "the solemnity of the occasion," should be sent to represent the "temper and sensibilities of the country." Messrs. Pinckney, Gerry, and Marshall were appointed commissioners, and instructed "*to terminate our differences in such manner, as . . . might be the best calculated to produce mutual satisfaction and good understanding.*" Their treatment was a disgrace to the French nation. Two of them demanded their passports and returned home. Mr. Gerry remained till officially and peremptorily recalled. Still there was no war. America was put in a state of defence — not in a state of offence. The opposition then made to even these measures is well known. Some were desirous of war; still pacific counsels prevailed. The reason was — the American government desired to keep the peace. Yet the depredations committed on the property and persons of American citizens were enormous. "Occasion," says Mr. Marshall, "was repeatedly taken to insult the American government; open war was continued to be waged by the cruisers of France on American commerce; and the flag of the United States was a sufficient justification for the capture and condemnation of any vessel over which it waved." More than three hundred American vessels had been taken by the French, and the amount of their depredations was estimated at over \$15,000,000. Still, President Adams said —

"In demonstrating . . . that we do not fear war in the necessary protection of our rights and honor, we shall give no room to infer that we abandon the desire of peace. . . . It is peace that we have uniformly and perseveringly cultivated, and *harmony between us and France may be restored at her option.*" *

We are surprised that Mr. Polk should lay any stress on the refusal of Mexico to receive Mr. Slidell. To receive a minister is a duty of imperfect obligation, as the Publicists would have told him. Any State may refuse to receive a particular person as minister, without violating the comity of nations, if she objects to the personal character of the man, or to the diplomatic character of the minister. This is so

* Adams's Second Annual Address, Dec. 8th, 1798. See too the "Address in Reply," by the House of Representatives.

well understood that it is useless to refer to authorities.* The refusal to receive Mr. Slidell — for the reasons given — was a matter of no great magnitude or importance. Mexico had never agreed to receive a minister with full powers, to reside near her government as a permanent representative of the nation, only a commissioner to treat in reference to the Texan difficulties. But take the President's statement of the case; admit that it was foolish on the part of Mexico, under such circumstances, to reject Mr. Slidell, because America had committed a breach of diplomatic etiquette; suppose it was weak and silly — it was certainly no ground for war. It is quite plain that Mr. Slidell was a very unsuitable person to send on a mission of peace to an offended nation. His correspondence proves this. He may be a very illustrious citizen of Louisiana; but few men in America, we think, out of that State, ever heard much good of him before his appointment to this mission. His conduct while there reflects no honor on America. We cannot think he was sent there with the serious intention of settling the difficulties in a just and honorable manner. Indeed, some of his instructions seem given him quite as much with a view to influence public opinion in America, as to have an effect on the Mexican government. This will appear by the following extract from Mr. Buchanan's letter to him, under date of March 12th, 1846:

"On your return to the United States, *energetic measures against Mexico would at once be recommended by the President; and these might fail to obtain the support of Congress, if it could be asserted that the existing government* [that of Paredes, the military president, who succeeded Herrera,] *had not refused to receive our minister.*"

This was written nearly two months *after* General Taylor had been ordered to move to the Rio Grande. The "energetic measures" were already commenced, though without the knowledge of Congress. America was invading territory which Mexico claimed, and at the same time instructing her minister to present his credentials with a view to adjust the difficulties in a pacific way! This, we confess, is extraordinary. The President did not know the minister would be rejected by Paredes when he ordered General Taylor to advance into Tamaulipas, and he was not rejected till two months

* Any one may see the authorities in Wheaton's *Law of Nations*, Part III. ch. 1.

after that order. But we must return to this mission of Mr. Slidell in another page.

The man who could logically adduce the above grievances in order to justify America, would do it with the tacit admission that she began the war; else why undertake to justify it? If Mexico began the war, that was her business. She is to justify it if she can. America may have a thousand reasons for making a war, but if she has not made it, she has no reason for undertaking to justify a war which she did not begin. The President may state other grievances, but not in such a connection, or for such a purpose as the present. But now he abandons that part of the argument; the issue is changed. It is Mexico that began the war. But how? By invading our territory. The Mexican general, says Mr. Polk, "had collected a large army on the opposite [the west] shore of the Rio Grande," "invaded our territory, and commenced hostilities by attacking our forces." Thus Mexico "*consummated her long course of outrages by commencing an offensive war, and shedding the blood of our citizens on our own soil.*"

It is true that on the 4th of April, 1846, General Paredes did order the commander on the Texan frontier to attack the enemy "by every means which war permits," and on the 18th of April, to the same person, adds, "I suppose you . . . either fighting already or preparing for the operations of a campaign." "It is indispensable that hostilities be commenced, yourself taking the initiative." But where was the enemy to be attacked; was he to take the initiative by making an invasion or repelling one?

To answer this question, we are to show what was the western boundary of Texas. Was it the Rio Grande, the Nueces, or some line between them, or elsewhere? Mr. Polk claims to the Rio Grande. These are the arguments which he adduces.

1. "Texas as ceded by France in 1803 has been always claimed as extending west to the Rio Grande," and accordingly the United States asserted and maintained their territorial rights to this extent till 1819, when it was ceded to Spain. It is on the strength of this claim that annexation is a re-annexation.

2. The republic of Texas always claimed this river—from the mouth to the source—as her western boundary, and it was recognized as such by Santa Anna himself, in 1836.

3. For more than nine years Texas "exercised many acts

of sovereignty and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants west of the Nueces."

4. Congress understood that the Rio Grande, from source to mouth, was the boundary of Texas in 1845, when the act of annexation was passed. "This was the Texas which . . . was admitted as one of the States of our Union."

All this is specious — at least to one who knows nothing of the facts; very plausible to one who is more a subject of Authority than a subject of Reason. But certainly Mexico had never admitted the Rio Grande from source to mouth as her boundary on this side. We think there is no controversy about the limits of Texas, except as it borders on the Mexican territory. Yet uncertainty of limits is recognized by America in the very act of annexation. The "joint resolutions" say: "1. Congress doth consent that the territory *properly included within and rightfully belonging to the republic of Texas* may be erected into a new State." And "2. Said State to be formed *subject to the adjustment of the government of all questions of boundary that may arise with other governments.*" Here the limits are admitted to be doubtful, and are to be adjusted by the government.

Suppose this were all, that the boundary was simply doubtful — what was the just and proper course to pursue? to send an army to the extreme and doubtful limit of the territory which we claimed? If so, then Mexico — who thought at least her claim equally good — had the same right. What if that course had been pursued with England in settling the question of the "northeastern boundary," or the boundary of the Oregon territory; what if England had acted by the same rule, and the two nations, without a single attempt to settle the matter by negotiation, had sent an "army of occupation" to take military possession, each power up to the extent of its own claims? Why it would have been — like what we have seen in Texas.

But why did not the American government resort to negotiation? Because the Mexican government would not receive a special commissioner appointed for that work? Not at all: she rejected Mr. Slidell because he was *not* such a special commissioner. "The sword," says somebody, "ends all popular evils, but cures none." It certainly begins a great many. The reason why the American government sent the sword before the negotiator will appear in due time.

It is by no means clear that the Americans had a good and

clear title to the Rio Grande, from end to end. A claim is one thing, a clear title is a little different. Did the American government claim the Rio Grande as the boundary of Louisiana, as ceded by France in 1803? So we claimed western Florida as a part of the same Louisiana. Mr. Jefferson, in 1805, said its limits were "the Perdido on the east, and the Brazo [the Rio Grande] on the west." It turned out to be a mistake. The claim was purely diplomatic, the claim of much in order to get all that could be had. Such are the morals of pedlers in politics as of pedlers in other wares. America had a claim to the whole of Oregon, from San Francisco to the Russian settlements. Mr. Polk himself claimed up to 54. 40, and with "the settled conviction that the *British pretensions of title could not be maintained to any portion of the Oregon territory.*" He asserted "our title to the whole Oregon territory," and thought it was "maintained by irrefragable facts and arguments." The legislature of one of the New England States, we are told, went further, and declared our right up to 54. 49. But, somehow, in the thaw of a negotiation, the claim gradually melted away, and reached no further than the 49th parallel of latitude.

It would be easy to show, whatsoever was the true western boundary of Texas, that it was not the Rio Grande. However, we do not intend at present entering upon that discussion. The reader will find much valuable information in the speech of Mr. Senator Benton, and in the two able and learned speeches of Mr. Severance, of Maine, delivered the one in the House of Representatives at Washington, Feb. 4th, 1847, and the other in the Legislature of Maine, July 27th, 1847. We shall for the present confine ourselves to the correspondence between Mr. A. J. Donelson and Mr. Buchanan, only premising that Mr. Donelson was sent by the American government in March, 1845, to Texas, to complete the work of annexation.* We shall show from this correspondence—

1. That it was well known that Texas had no just claim to the Rio Grande as her western boundary.

2. That war was expected as the consequence of the annexation of Texas.

3. That there was a concerted scheme to throw the blame of the war upon Mexico, by provoking her to commence hostilities.

* The correspondence is published in Doc. No. 2, 29th Congress, 1st Session.

I. IT WAS WELL KNOWN THAT TEXAS HAD NO JUST CLAIM TO THE RIO GRANDE.

"It is believed that Mexico is concentrating troops on the Rio Grande, where *Texas has, as yet, established no posts.*" — p. 53.

Mr. Jones, President of the republic of Texas, issued a proclamation on the 4th of June, 1845, at the end of which he says, "*I do hereby declare and proclaim a cessation of hostilities by land and sea against the republic of Mexico.*" — p. 63. But the Mexican forces were still east of the Rio Grande, though west of the Nueces. The chargé saw the effect which this proclamation, issued under such circumstances, would have upon the claim to the Rio Grande; — this will appear in the sequel.

June 23d, 1845, he writes to Mr. Buchanan, "It is the policy of those who are on the side of Mexico, . . . to throw upon the United States the *responsibility of a war for the country between the Nueces and the Rio Grande.* That territory, you are aware, has been in the possession of both parties. Texas has held in peace Corpus Christi; Mexico has held Santiago. Both parties have had occasional possession of Laredo, and other higher points." — p. 74.

June 22d, he writes to Commodore Stockton in relation to the prospects of a war, and adds, "It is to be hoped, however, that Mexico . . . will yet prefer to settle by treaty the points in dispute," that is, the question of limits. — p. 78.

Again, July 2d, he writes to Mr. Buchanan, "My position is that we can hold [because we have a good title] Corpus Christi and all other points up the Nueces. *If attacked, [while in territory which the Mexicans acknowledge as part of Texas] the right of defence will authorize us to expel the Mexicans as far as the Rio Grande.*" — p. 78.

"The government [of Texas] left for treaty arrangement the boundary question in the propositions for a treaty of definite peace." — p. 79. This refers to "the preliminary articles of the negotiation" offered by President Jones to the Mexican government. The 3d article is as follows: "*Limits and other subjects of mutual interest to be settled by negotiation.*" — p. 55.

June 28th, he writes to General Taylor, advising him where to station his troops. "*Corpus Christi is said to be as healthy as Pensacola, a convenient place for supplies, and is the most western point now occupied by Texas.*" — p. 83. Yet Corpus

Christi is on the west bank of the Nueces. "The occupation of the country between the Nueces and the Rio Grande is a disputed question." — p. 83.

July 11th, he thus writes to Mr. Buchanan :

"You will have observed that in my correspondence with this government [of Texas] there has been no discussion of the question of limits between Mexico and Texas. The joint resolutions of our Congress left the question an open one, and the preliminary proposition made by this [the Texan] government [namely, the third article quoted on the last page] . . . left the question in the same state, and although this [the Texan] government has since indicated a point on the Rio Grande for the [future] occupation of our troops, I did not consider this circumstance as varying the question, since the President, but a few weeks before, issued a proclamation suspending hostilities between Texas and Mexico, the practical effect of which was to leave the question precisely as it stood when our joint resolutions passed, — Mexico in possession of one portion of the territory, [between the Nueces and the Rio Grande] and Texas of another. If the President of Texas, instead of giving that proclamation the scope he did, [by making an entire suspension of hostilities while the Mexican army was on the east of the Rio Grande,] had made it conditional upon the withdrawal of all Mexican authority to the west bank of the Rio Grande, or in failure thereof, [of withdrawing the forces beyond that river] had notified Mexico that forcible means would have been continued, to maintain the jurisdiction of Texas as far as that river, *the case would have been different, and our rights and duties* consequent upon an invasion of Texas, [an invasion by Mexico of the territory between the Rio Grande and Nueces,] after her [the Mexican] acceptance of our proposals, *would have been accordingly changed.*" That is, Mexico would have acknowledged that our claims to that territory had a respectable foundation. But the Texan President had little confidence in that claim, and never offered such a condition ! "Hence you will have perceived, that in my reply to Mr. Allen's [the Texan Secretary of State] note of the 26th ult., I omitted an allusion to his suggestion of a point on the Rio Grande for the occupation of our troops."

The reason doubtless was because Mr. Donelson knew the occupation of a point on the Rio Grande was an act of war against Mexico, and did not himself wish to take the initiative by commencing hostilities.

"The proclamation of a truce between the two nations, founded on propositions mutually acceptable to them, leaving the question

of boundary not only an open one, but *Mexico in possession of the east bank of the Rio Grande, seemed to me inconsistent with the expedition that in defence of the claim of Texas, our troops should march immediately to that river. What the Executive of Texas had determined not to fight for, but to settle by negotiation, to say the least of it, could as well be left to the United States on the same conditions.*"

Mr. Donelson took this course because he did not wish to have a public altercation with the Texan President "in regard to an important measure of his administration." Still he thinks the Texan "claim" to the Rio Grande ought to be maintained. The only question was,

"Whether, under the circumstances, *we should take a position to make war for this claim, in the face of an acknowledgment on the part of this [the Texan] government that it could be settled by negotiation.* I at once decided that we should take no such position, but should regard only as within the limits of our protection that portion of territory actually possessed by Texas, and which she did not consider as subject to negotiation. The Congress of Texas . . . would have passed a resolution . . . affirming the claim to the Rio Grande . . . if they had deemed it expedient in this matter to manifest their disapprobation of the treaty preferred by President Jones, or to oppose the inference which might be drawn from his proclamation, that Texas admitted the right of Mexico to keep an armed force this side of the Rio Grande." — p. 89.

Mr. Donelson thought it inexpedient "for Texas to attempt a forcible possession of the Rio Grande," because

"Leaving out of view the difficulty of conducting such an enterprise against the consent of the [Texan] Executive, the influence on the . . . Mexican population [the entire population] bordering the Rio Grande would have been unfavorable to the United States. These people, long harassed by the military exactions of their own government, [the Mexican government, though Mr. Polk insists that Texas for more than nine years has exercised sovereignty here,] seek for nothing so ardently as escape from violence. . . . They have been often visited by the Texans, who in revenge of their slaughtered comrades, and of the faithless conduct of Santa Anna, have not been disposed to mitigate the blows of retaliation." On the other hand, "Texas, by remaining passive, . . . is gradually strengthening her ability to introduce, by peaceful means, her authority as far up the Rio Grande as she may please." — p. 90.

Mr. Donelson then states the grounds on which the claim to the Rio Grande would be defensible.

1. "The revolutionary right of the people of Texas to resist oppression and enforce such a political organization as they deemed necessary."

2. "The acknowledgment of Santa Anna in 1836, . . . *by which Texas was prevented from following up the advantages of victory, among which was the opportunity of establishing herself on the Rio Grande.*"

3. "The capacity of Texas, if not now, at least in a short period, to establish by force her claim to this boundary. This capacity is fairly inferrible from the offer of Mexico to recognize her independence, and is self-evident to all who have any knowledge of the relative power and position of Mexico and Texas."

4. "The United States, . . . in addition to the foregoing grounds, will have the older one, founded on the Louisiana claim."

5. "But . . . all these considerations are but subsidiary to the necessity which exists for the establishment of the Rio Grande as the boundary between the two nations." "Texas has at pleasure taken possession of her [the Mexican] posts there, and has only suspended jurisdiction because it was inconvenient to maintain it. . . . On such grounds it cannot be doubted that Mexico already considers the whole of the territory between the Rio Grande and the Nueces as lost to her."

"There is a disposition in some members to resort to some action, the expectation of Texas that the Rio Grande will be maintained as the boundary, but no provision making this a *sine qua non* in our action hereafter will be adopted." — pp. 91, 92.

Let us take a word of comment from another source. In 1836, General Jackson sent Mr. Morfit to Texas, to learn the state of things. Mr. Morfit thus writes, in August, 1836:

"It was the intention of this [the Texan] government, immediately after the battle of San Jacinto, to have claimed from the Rio Grande along the river to the thirtieth degree of latitude, and thence due west to the Pacific. It was found, however, that this would not strike a convenient point in California, . . . and that the territory now determined on would be sufficient for a new republic." "The political limits of Texas proper were the Nueces

River on the west," &c. "The additional territory claimed by Texas since the declaration of independence, . . will increase her population at least 15,000." — *Doc. of Ho. of Rep.*, 2d Sess., 24th Cong, No. 35.

Mr. C. J. Ingersoll, in his speech on the 3d of March, 1845, said,

"The . . deserts between the Nueces and the Bravo [the Rio Grande] are the natural boundaries. . . There ends the Valley of the West. There Mexico begins. While peace is cherished that boundary will be respected. *Not till the spirit of conquest rages will the people on either side molest or mix with each other.*"

II. WAR WAS EXPECTED AS THE CONSEQUENCE OF THE ANNEXATION.

In his letter of June 4th, 1845, to Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Donelson says,

"If Mexico takes possession of the country between the Nueces and the Rio Grande, and comes still further east within the Texan territory, . . are the United States to stand still? . . Mexico has about seven thousand troops on the Rio Grande." "I look upon war as inevitable, — a war . . intended . . to deprive both Texas and the United States of all claim to the *country between the Nueces and the Rio Grande.*" — p. 54.

June 22d, writing to Mr. Buchanan, he says, "The British minister — who has been recently to Mexico — informed President Jones that he thought war would be the consequence of the determination of Texas to accept the terms of annexation." — p. 55.

Again, in writing to Mr. Allen, June 11th, 1845, he says,

"Mr. Allen remarks 'that a new invasion of Texas may be reasonably apprehended, if the proposals [of annexation] lately received from the United States . . should be accepted.' . . . 'Such a war would be hastened and occasioned by the acts and aimed at the interests, no less of the United States than of Texas.' . . The undersigned is authorized to say that a force consisting of three thousand men, . . will be prepared to act without a moment's delay," &c. — p. 57.

Again to the same, June 13th —

"Such an invasion, occasioned by the acts of the United States, . . it will of course be the duty of the President of the United States to repel." — p. 69.

June 22d, 1845, he writes to Captain Stockton, "The prospect of a Mexican war is so immediate as to justify your remaining on the lookout for the worst. It is openly threatened by Mexico." — p. 78.

June 26th, he writes to Mr. Buchanan,

"The very preference manifested by . . . Texas for annexation . . . must be mortifying to the pride of Mexico, and may very probably induce her to commence against this country sudden and active hostilities." — p. 80.

June 28th, he thus writes to General Taylor: . . . "An invasion of Texas may be confidently anticipated." — p. 93.

July 24th, 1845, he writes to Mr. Buchanan,

"The common opinion of the citizens best acquainted with the Mexican population is, that the [Mexican] government will be obliged to declare war." — p. 96.

III. THERE WAS A SCHEME TO THROW THE BLAME OF THE WAR UPON MEXICO.

June 11th, 1845, he writes to Mr. Buchanan, "Care will be taken to *throw the responsibility of aggressive measures on the government of Mexico.*" — p. 56.

Again to the same, June 23d,

"If she undertakes such an expedition, she of course puts upon the hazard of war the whole claim, and *gives us the right of going not only to the Rio Grande, but wherever else we may please.*" — p. 74.

July 2d:

"It is better for us to await the attack than incur the risk of embarrassing the question of annexation with the consequences of immediate possession of the territory to the Rio Grande. *You will find that I have guarded every point.*" "It appeared to me wiser to look for some advantage from the assailing movement threatened by Mexico, than to resist the passage [by the Texan Congress] of . . . a law . . . putting the Texan forces under the Major-General, the effect of which would have been the immediate expulsion of all Mexican soldiers found on the east bank of the Rio Grande. If by such a law the whole of the Texan claim, in respect to limits, could have been taken out of dispute, *its passage would have been insisted upon; but as there would have remained all the Santa Fe region, it occurred to me well enough that the subject is left as it is by this Congress.*" — p. 79.

June 28th, he writes to General Taylor,

"I would by no means be understood as advising you to take an offensive attitude in regard to Mexico. . . . The probability is, if Mexico undertakes the invasion, that she will attempt to drive you from the points suggested for your occupation [Corpus Christi and a point between that and San Antonio]. In that event, *your right of defence will of course authorize you to cripple and destroy the Mexican army in the best way you can.* You can safely hold possession of Corpus Christi and all other points up the Nueces, and if Mexico attempts to dislodge you, *drive her beyond the Rio Grande.*" — pp. 93, 94.

Mr. Slidell, the pacific Envoy of the United States — who does not seem to understand the policy of his superiors — on the 27th of December, 1845, thus writes to Mr. Buchanan :

"The desire of our government to have peace will be taken for timidity ; the most extravagant pretensions will be made and insisted upon, [by Mexico] until the Mexican people shall be convinced by hostile demonstrations that our differences must be settled promptly, either by negotiation or the sword."

We cannot forbear giving the opinion of some other men, and very eminent too, not only in the estimation of the democratic party, to which they belong, but in that of the country at large. The first is from a speech of the late Hon. Silas Wright, a man richly entitled to a distinguished place among the politicians of the day. In his address, delivered at Watertown, New York, in the summer of 1844, he says,

"I felt it my duty to vote as a Senator, and did vote against the . . . treaty for the annexation [of Texas]. I believed that *the treaty . . . embraced a country to which Texas had no claim,* over which she had never asserted jurisdiction, and which she had no right to cede. . . . The treaty ceded Texas by name, [but] without an effort to describe a boundary. The Congress of Texas had passed an act declaring . . . what was Texas. . . . We must take the country as Texas had ceded it to us, and in doing that . . . we must do injustice to Mexico, and take a large portion of New Mexico, the people of which have never been under the jurisdiction of Texas. This to me was an insurmountable barrier. I could not place the country in that position."

The authority of Col. Benton is confessedly great in all matters relating to our western boundaries. He merits the gratitude of the nation for his able discussion of our claims to

"the whole of Oregon." His motives may have been what his opponents alleged; we have nothing to do with that matter, only with his discussion, his facts, and his arguments. His speech in the Senate, on the 16th, 17th, and 20th of May, 1844, is well known. We give the resolutions offered by that distinguished member of the democratic party, on the 13th of May, while the treaty was still pending.

"*Resolved*, That the ratification of the treaty for the annexation of Texas to the United States would be an adoption of the Texian war with Mexico by the United States, and would devolve its conduct and conclusion upon the United States.

"*Resolved*, That the treaty-making power does not extend to the right of making war, and that the President and Senate have no right to make war, either by declaration or adoption."

In his speech, after reciting the rights already claimed by Texas, he goes on to prove that this territory includes towns and villages and custom-houses in the peaceful possession of Mexico.

"First, there is the department . . . of New Mexico. . . . This department is studded with towns and villages, is populated, well cultivated, and covered with flocks and herds. On its left bank, (and I only speak of the part which we propose to *re-annex*,) is first the frontier village, Taos, 3000 souls, where the custom-house is kept, at which our Missouri caravans enter their goods. Then comes Santa Fe, the capital, 4000 souls; then Albuquerque, 6000 souls; thence some scores of other towns and villages, all more or less populated, and surrounded by flocks and fields. Then come the departments of Chihuahua, Coahuila, and Tamaulipas, without settlements on the left bank of the river, but occupying the right bank, and commanding the left. All this — being parts of four departments — now under Mexican governors, or governments, is permanently re-annexed to this Union, if this treaty is ratified, and is actually re-annexed for the moment by the signature of the treaty, according to the President's last message, to remain so until the acquisition is rejected by rejecting the treaty."

"The President in his special message . . . informs us that we have acquired a title to the ceded territories by his signature to the treaty, wanting only the action of the Senate to perfect it; and that in the mean time he will protect it from invasion, and for that purpose has detached all the disposable parts of the army and navy to the scene of action. This is a caper about equal to the mad freaks with which the unfortunate Emperor Paul, of Russia, was accustomed to astonish Europe, about forty years ago. By this declaration, the thirty thousand Mexicans on the left half

of the Valley of the Rio del Norte are our citizens, and standing — in the language of the President's message — in a hostile attitude towards us, and subject to be repulsed as invaders. Taos, the seat of the custom-house, where our traders enter their goods, is ours; Santa Fe, the capital of New Mexico, is ours; Governor Armijo is our governor, and subject to be tried for treason if he does not submit to us; twenty Mexican towns and villages are ours; and their peaceful inhabitants, cultivating their fields and tending their flocks, are suddenly converted, by a stroke of the President's pen, into American citizens, or American rebels! This is too bad; and *instead of making themselves party to its enormities*, as the President invites them to do, *I think rather that it is the duty of the Senate to wash its hands of all this part of the transaction by a special disapprobation.* . . . I therefore propose as an additional resolution,

"Resolved, That the incorporation of the left bank of the Rio del Norte into the American Union, by virtue of a treaty with Texas, comprehending, as the said incorporation would do, a part of the Mexican departments of New Mexico, Chihuahua, Coahuila, and Tamaulipas, would be an act of direct aggression on Mexico, for all the consequences of which the United States would stand responsible."

In the remainder of his speech, Mr. Benton made four points; namely,

1. "That the ratification of the treaty would be, of itself, war between the United States and Mexico."
2. "That it would be unjust war."
3. "That it would be war unconstitutionally made."
4. "That it would be war upon a weak and groundless pretext."*

In his speech delivered in the secret session, and of course not published, he declared that if America claimed to the Rio Grande, "if there were but one man of Spanish blood in all Mexico, and he no bigger than Tom Thumb, he would fight."

Yet further, Senator Ashley, of Arkansas, in his speech, said — though not in the *corrected* copy, — "I will here add, that *the present boundaries* [of Texas] I have from Judge

* The whole speech of Mr. Benton is worthy an attentive reading at this time. It may be found in the "Globe" of that period. In connection with the third point, we would quote the letter of Chancellor Kent, dated May 21st, 1844. ". . . I think there can be no doubt, that the enormous abuses and stretch of power by President Tyler afford ample materials for the exercise of the power of impeachment, and it is an imperative duty on the House of Representatives to put it in practice."

Ellis — the president of the convention that formed the constitution of Texas, and also a member of the first legislature under that constitution — *were fixed as they now are [to the Rio Grande] solely and professedly with a view of having a large margin in the negotiation with Mexico, and we had no expectation of retaining them as they now exist on our statute book.*"

We will now return to the mission of Mr. Slidell, and state the facts so far as we can gather them. We shall rely wholly on official documents accompanying the President's special message of May 11th, 1846, "relative to an invasion and commencement of hostilities by Mexico."* It contains the correspondence of the American consul at Mexico, and Mr. Slidell, with the previous Mexican authorities. This correspondence, however, is but imperfectly published. The frequent asterisks show how much is still concealed from the public eye, no doubt for very good reasons. The instructions of the American government to Mr. Slidell are not in this document, nor do we remember ever to have seen them in print. What adds to the difficulty is this: the documents of the Mexican authorities are not published in their original language, but in a translation, on which we cannot always place entire confidence. Indeed, one very important phrase is made to receive two very different translations, as we shall presently show.

On the 17th of September, 1845, Mr. Buchanan, at the command of Mr. Polk, desired Mr. Black, the American consul at Mexico, "to ascertain from the Mexican government whether they would receive an envoy from the United States, intrusted with full power to adjust all the questions in dispute between the two governments." — p. 8. Mr. Black made the inquiry, and Mr. Peña y Peña, the "minister of foreign relations and government," thus replied, Oct. 25th, 1845:

"In answer, I have to say to you, that although the Mexican nation is deeply injured by the United States, through the acts committed by them in the department of Texas, which belongs to this nation, my government is disposed to receive the *commissioner of the United States* who may come to this capital, *with full powers* from his government to settle the present dispute in a *peaceful, reasonable, and honorable* manner; thus giving a new

* Doc. No. 196, 29th Congress, 1st Sess., Ho. of Rep.

proof, that even in the midst of its injuries and of its firm decision to exact adequate reparation for them, it does not repel with contumely the measure of reason and peace, to which it is invited by its adversary.

"As my government believes this invitation to be made in good faith, . . . it also hopes that the commissioner will be a person endowed with the qualities proper for the attainment of this end; that his dignity, prudence, and moderation, and the discreteness and reasonableness of his proposals will contribute to calm, as much as possible, the just irritation of the Mexicans, and in fine, that the conduct of the commissioner on all points may be such as to persuade them that they may obtain satisfaction for their injuries, through the means of reason and peace, and without being obliged to resort to those of arms and force." — p. 12.

Mr. Polk asked if Mexico would receive an envoy "with full power to adjust *all the questions in dispute*." Mexico offers to receive one with full powers to settle *the present dispute* in a peaceful, reasonable, and honorable manner. She does not offer to receive a *resident* minister, nor a special minister to settle "all the questions in dispute," but only the "present dispute," namely, the *difficulties growing out of the matter of Texas*. Not a word is said in the correspondence of the parties about a minister "to reside near the Mexican government," as a permanent representative. Perhaps Mr. Peña y Peña ought to have distinctly stated that Mexico would not receive such a minister. He only told what Mexico *would* receive; not what she would not. Still further, it seems there was a "council of government," whom Mr. Peña y Peña did not consult before answering Mr. Black's note, and offering to receive a special commissioner.

Mr. Slidell was sent, furnished with a "letter of credence" from President Polk, authorizing him "*to reside near the government of the Mexican republic, in the quality of envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States*." — p. 22. It is quite plain Mr. Slidell was not such a commissioner as Mexico had offered to receive. The difference between *an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary*, sent "to reside near the government," and a *special commissioner sent to adjust a single dispute*, is as obvious as the difference between an egg and an apple.

After various preliminaries, Dec. 8th, Mr. Slidell asked to be accredited as "envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary," "to reside near the government of the Mexican

republic. As no formal answer came, he renewed the request on the 15th. The next day (Dec. 16th), the Mexican minister answers, that

The delay has "arisen solely from certain difficulties occasioned by the nature of these credentials as compared with the proposition made by the United States, through their consul, to treat peacefully upon *the affairs of Texas*. . . It has been found necessary to submit the said credentials to the council of government, for its opinion with regard to them." — p. 25.

Dec. 20th, Mr. Slidell was officially informed by Senor Peña y Peña,

That the supreme government "does not conceive that, in order to fulfil the object proposed by the said consul in the name of the American government and accepted by the undersigned [Peña y Peña], it should admit his excellency Mr. Slidell in the character with which he is invested."

"This proposition, as well as its acceptance, rested upon the precise and definite understanding that a commissioner should be *ad hoc* — that is to say, *commissioned to settle*, in a peaceful and honorable manner, *the questions relative to Texas*. . . Mr. Slidell does not come invested with that character, . . . although it is true, that in the credential letter brought by his excellency Mr. Slidell, it is stated that he is informed of the desire of the President of the United States to *restore*, cultivate, and strengthen friendship and good correspondence between the two countries. It is also no less true that in this clause the single word *restore* is by no means sufficient to give to Mr. Slidell the special character of commissioner, or plenipotentiary *ad hoc* — to make propositions as to the affairs of Texas, calculated to establish peace firmly and to avert the evils of war by adequate agreement." "The admission of such a minister [an absolute and general minister, an ordinary plenipotentiary, to reside near the Mexican government,] should be . . . *preceded by the agreement*, which the United States propose to enter into, *for the establishment of peace and good correspondence with Mexico*, interrupted by the occurrences of Texas, — this point being, from its very nature, necessary to be attained before any other; and until it shall have been entirely and peacefully settled, not even an *appointment* should be made of a resident minister, by either of the two governments."

"The supreme government of Mexico, therefore, cannot admit his excellency Mr. Slidell to the exercise of the functions of the mission conferred on him by the United States government. But as the sentiments expressed by the undersigned . . . are in no wise changed, he now repeats them, adding that he will have the

utmost pleasure in treating with Mr. Slidell, as soon as he shall have presented credentials authorizing him expressly and exclusively to settle the questions which have disturbed the harmony and good understanding between the two republics, and which will bring on war between them unless such settlement be effected in a satisfactory manner, to which the proposition of the government of the United States related, and under the express understanding of which the proposition was accepted by the Mexican government." — pp. 41, 42. See also p. 44.

To this Mr. Slidell angrily replies, on the 24th of December, and makes a remarkable mistake on referring to the letter of the Mexican government offering to accept a commissioner. Mr. Slidell says, "The Mexican government declared 'itself disposed to receive the commissioner of the United States, who might come to their capital with full powers to settle *these disputes* in a peaceful, reasonable, and honorable manner.'" — p. 35. Whereas the Mexican minister only expressed a readiness to receive a commissioner with full power "to settle the *present dispute*." — p. 32. Comment is needless.

There was evidently a mistake — or a blunder — on the part of the American government. The Mexican government gave America a chance to rectify the error, by recalling Mr. Slidell and sending a special commissioner in his place, with such powers as the occasion demanded, or sending such powers to Mr. Slidell. We think the government of France, of England, or even of Austria, would have done so. We have before shown what was done by President Adams when Mr. Pinckney was rejected. But March 21st, 1846, Mr. Buchanan thus writes to Mr. Slidell: —

"Should the Mexican government, by finally refusing to receive you, consummate the act of folly and bad faith of which they have afforded such strong indications, nothing will then remain for this government but to take the redress of the wrongs of its citizens into its own hands. In the event of such a refusal, . . . you ought . . . so to conduct yourself as to *throw the whole odium of the failure of the negotiation upon the Mexican government*." "The desire of the President is, that you should conduct yourself with such wisdom and firmness at the crisis that the voice of the American people shall be unanimous in favor of redressing the wrongs of our much injured and long suffering claimants." "*In the meantime, the President, in anticipation of the final refusal of the Mexican government to receive you, has ordered the army of Texas to advance and take position on the left bank of the Rio Grande; and has directed that a strong fleet shall be assembled*

in the Gulf of Mexico. He will thus be prepared to act with vigor and promptitude the moment that Congress shall give him authority." — p. 45.

On the first of March, Mr Slidell writes to Senor Castillo y Lanzas, successor of Peña y Peña, and says,

"The President is unwilling to take a course which would inevitably result in war [!] without making another effort to avert so great a calamity. He wishes, by exhausting every honorable means of conciliation, to demonstrate to the civilized world, *that if its peace shall be disturbed, the responsibility must fall on Mexico alone.* He is sincerely desirous to preserve that peace; but the state of quasi hostility which now exists on the part of Mexico [by her declining to receive Mr. Slidell] is one which is incompatible with the dignity and interests of the United States; and it is for the Mexican government to decide whether it shall give place to friendly negotiation, or lead to an open rupture." — p. 54.

To this, Senor Castillo y Lanzas replied, on the 12th,

"That the Mexican government cannot receive him [Mr. Slidell] as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to reside near it. . . . It is true, that the warlike display with which the American Union presents herself — by sea, with her squadrons on both coasts; by land, with her invading forces advancing by the northern frontiers; [where the President had ordered them two months before, without waiting till Congress gave him authority,] at the same time that by her minister plenipotentiary propositions are made for conciliation and accommodation — would be a sufficiently powerful reason for not listening to them, so long as all threatening shall not be withdrawn, even to the slightest appearance of hostility. But even this is waived by the government of the republic, in order that it may in all frankness and loyalty enter into the discussion, relying solely upon reason and facts. . . . The vehement desire of the government of the United States to extend its already immense territory at the expense of that of Mexico, has been manifest for many years; and it is beyond all doubt that, in regard to Texas at least, this has been their firm and constant determination; for it has been so declared categorically and officially by an authorized representative of the Union, whose assertion, strange and injurious as was its frankness, has nevertheless not been belied by the United States.*

* Even Mr. Van Buren, writing to Mr. Hammett, said, (April 20th, 1844,) "Nothing is either more true or more extensively known, than that *Texas was wrested from Mexico, and her independence established through the instrumentality of citizens of the United States.*"

"Considering the time as having come for carrying into effect the annexation of Texas, the United States, in union and by agreement with their natural allies and adherents in that territory, enacted the means for the purpose. The project was introduced into the American Congress. It was, at first, frustrated, thanks to the prudential consideration, the circumspection, and the wisdom, with which the Senate of the United States then proceeded. Nevertheless, the project was reproduced in the following session, and was then approved and sanctioned in the form and terms known to the whole world.

"A fact such as this, or to speak with greater exactness, so notable an act of usurpation, created an imperious necessity that Mexico . . . should repel it with proper firmness and dignity. The supreme government had beforehand declared that it would look upon such an act as a *casus belli*; and as a consequence of this declaration, negotiation was by its very nature at an end, and war was the only recourse of the Mexican government.

"But before it proceeded to recover its outraged rights, propositions were addressed to it from the so called President of Texas, which had for their object to enter into an amicable accommodation upon the basis of her independence; and the government agreed to hear them, and consented to name the commissioners who, with this view, were sent to it from Texas.

"Moments so precious were not thrown away by the agents of the United States in Texas. Availing themselves of the statu quo of Mexico, they so prepared matters and directed affairs, that the already enacted annexation to the American Union should follow almost immediately.*

"Thus this incorporation of a territory which had constituted an integral part of that of Mexico during the long period of the Spanish dominion, and after her emancipation, for so long a time, without any interruption whatever, and which measure had been recognized and sanctioned by the treaty of limits between the Mexican republic and the United States of America — was effected by the reprobated means of violence and fraud.

"Civilized nations have beheld with amazement, at this enlightened and refined epoch, a powerful and well consolidated State, availing itself of the internal dissensions of a neighbouring nation, putting its vigilance to sleep by protestations of friendship, setting in action all manner of springs and artifices, alternately plying intrigue and violence, and seizing a moment to despoil her of a precious part of her territory, regardless of the

* The recent letter of Mr. Tyler in the Washington (weekly) Union, of Aug. 12th, is a good commentary on this part of the letter.

incontrovertible rights of the most unquestionable ownership and the most uninterrupted possession.

"Here, then, is the true position of the Mexican republic; despoiled, outraged, contemned, it is now attempted to subject her to a humiliating degradation." — pp. 57-59.

"It is manifest that it was the firm intention of the Mexican government to admit only a plenipotentiary from the United States clothed with powers *ad hoc* — that is to say, special powers to treat upon the question of Texas, and upon this alone, as preliminary to the renewal of friendly relations between the two countries, if the result should be such as to admit of their restoration, and then, but not before, of an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary near the same government.

"Nor could the government of the republic on that occasion extend its engagement beyond this; for to admit any person sent by the United States in the character simply of the ordinary agents between friendly nations, whilst the grave question of Texas was still pending, . . . would be equivalent to an acknowledgment that the question was at an end, thus prejudging it without even touching it, and to a recognition that the relations of friendship and harmony between the two nations, were from that moment in fact reestablished.

"In the actual state of things, to say that Mexico maintains a position of quasi hostility with respect to the United States, is to add a new offence to her previous injuries. Her attitude is one of defence, because she has herself been unjustly attacked; because a portion of her territory is occupied by the forces of a nation, intent, without any right whatever, to possess itself of it; because her ports are threatened by the squadrons of the same power.

"*It is then not upon Mexico, seeing her present state, that it devolves to decide if the issue shall be a friendly negotiation or an open rupture.* It is long since her interests have made this necessary, and her dignity has demanded it; but in the hope of an accommodation at once honorable and specific, she has silenced the claims of those imperious exigencies.

"It follows, that if war should finally become inevitable, and if in consequence of this war, the peace of the civilized world should be disturbed, *the responsibility will not fall upon Mexico.* It will all rest upon the United States; to them will the whole of it belong. Not upon Mexico, — who, with a generosity unequalled, admitted the American citizens who wished to colonize in Texas, — but upon the United States, who, bent upon possessing themselves, early or late, of that territory, encouraged emigration thither with that view, in order that in due time, its inhabitants, converting themselves from colonists into its masters, should claim the country as their own, for the purpose of transferring it to the United

States; not upon Mexico, who, having in due season protested against so enormous a transgression, wished to remove all cause for controversy and hostilities, but upon the United States, who, to the scandal of the world, and in violation of treaties, gave protection and aid to those guilty of a violation so iniquitous. Not upon Mexico, who, in the midst even of injuries so great and so repeated, has shown herself disposed to admit propositions for conciliation, but upon the United States, who, pretending sincerely to desire a friendly and honorable accommodation, have belied by their acts the sincerity of their words. Finally, not upon Mexico, who, putting out of view her ever dearest interests, through her desire for peace, has entertained as long as was wished the propositions which, with this view, might be made to her, but upon the United States, who, by frivolous pretexts, made the conclusion of such an arrangement, *proposing peace at the very moment when they are causing their squadrons and their troops to advance upon the ports and frontiers of Mexico, exacting a humiliation impossible to be submitted to, in order to find a pretext, if no reason can be found, which may occasion the breaking out of hostilities.*"

"It is therefore upon the United States, and not upon Mexico, that it devolves to determine in the alternative presented by Mr. Slidell — that is, between a friendly negotiation and an open rupture." — pp. 59 — 61.

Mr. Slidell, who all along had given so many indications of ignorance and folly — wrote such a letter as might have been looked for, demanded his passports, and returned home.

Attempts had been made to throw the responsibility and the odium of war upon Mexico, but Mexico would not take the initiative and declare war, nor commence an invasion without declaring it. What was to be done; shall the President ask Congress to declare war? The success of that would be hopeless. Shall he himself take the responsibility, and commence hostilities without the advice of Congress? There were yet other tricks to be tried — which were parallel in time with Mr. Slidell's mission to Mexico. We shall expose this matter by some quotations from the correspondence between the War Department and General Taylor. It is contained in the same document (No. 196) with the letters of Mr. Slidell. July 8th, 1845, Mr. Marcy — then Secretary of War — thus wrote to General Taylor:

"Mexico has some military establishments on the east side of the Rio Grande, which are . . . in the actual occupancy of her

troops. . . . The Mexican forces at the posts in their possession . . . will not be disturbed so long as the relations of peace . . . continue."

July 30th, he adds,

"The Rio Grande is claimed to be the boundary, . . . and up to this you are to extend your position, only excepting any posts on the eastern side thereof, which are in the actual occupancy of Mexican forces, or Mexican settlements over which Texas did not exercise jurisdiction at the period of annexation, or shortly before that event. It is expected that . . . you will approach as near the boundary line — the Rio Grande — as prudence will dictate. . . . The President desires that your position . . . should be near the river Nueces." — pp. 70, 71.

Here a snare is laid for the American general. *He* is to take the initiative and bear the responsibility, if Mexico will not. He is to decide what places were in the possession of Texas at the time of annexation, "or shortly before it." Let it be remarked, besides, that Texas exercised no more jurisdiction on the Rio Grande than she did on the Danube. Should General Taylor advance, should Mexico regard herself invaded, and Congress refuse to sanction that invasion — the President can say: General Taylor exceeded his instructions, went nearer than "prudence will dictate," entered places over which Texas did not "exercise any jurisdiction."

Again, Aug. 23d, Mr. Marcy writes,

"There is reason to believe that Mexico is making efforts to assemble a large army on the frontier of Texas, for the purpose of entering its territory. . . . Should Mexico assemble a *large* body of troops on the Rio Grande, and cross it with a *considerable* force, such a moment must be regarded as an invasion of the United States and the commencement of hostilities." — p. 72.

And again, in the letter of Aug. 30th, p. 76, he is authorized, in case of need, to call for volunteers from Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. — pp. 74, 75, et al. Here is the same trick repeated: — what is a *large* body of troops; what a *considerable* force?

General Taylor took position at Corpus Christi, "the most western point in the possession of Texas," as Mr. Donelson has often told us, though the General says, "I would have preferred a position on the left bank of the river." He could

not find any *considerable* force on the Rio Grande at all, still less, any thought of invasion.

Again, Mr. Marcy writes, "*There may be other acts on the part of Mexico which would put an end to the relations of peace.*"—p. 76. In such a case he is told that he may "cross the Rio Grande," and "take and hold possession of Metamoras."

General Taylor did not fall into the snare thus adroitly laid for him. He kept within the Texan limits. He writes that he does not want any volunteers, and hopes no more will be sent till called for; "that the consul is of opinion there will be no declaration of war" by Mexico; "the mass of the people is opposed to war with us." "I must express the hope that no militia force will be ordered to join me without my requisition." "I cannot believe that it will become necessary to employ volunteers from the United States."

After Marcy had finished his trap, set it, baited it with such instructions for General Taylor on the 30th of August, he waited till the 16th of October, as it appears from the published correspondence. Perhaps he was making arrangements for the mission to Mexico to negotiate a peace. Be that as it may, a month after Mr. Buchanan had written to Mexico, desiring that "all existing difficulties should be terminated amicably by negotiation and not by the sword," stating, also, that the President "is anxious to preserve peace," and while the American government was expecting pacific overtures from Mexico—he writes again to urge the General into the toils laid for him.

"Previous instructions will have put you in possession of the *views of the government* of the United States, *not only as to the extent of its territorial claims, but of its determination to assert them.* In carrying out these instructions, *you will be left very much to your own judgment.*" "You will approach as near the western boundary of Texas (the Rio Grande) as circumstances will permit. . . . Ought your present position [at Corpus Christi, 'the most western point in the possession of Texas,'] *to be changed? . . . You need not . . . wait for directions from Washington to carry out what you may deem proper to be done.*"—pp. 76, 77.

Then he speaks of "*the contingency of your selecting or being directed to take a position on the banks of the Rio Grande.*"—p. 77.

General Taylor, however, continued at Corpus Christi.

Perhaps he saw the snare; perhaps he thought it was not his business to take the responsibility of beginning a war with Mexico; at any rate, Nov. 7th, he writes,

"The position now occupied by the troops may, perhaps, be the best while negotiations are pending, or at any rate until a disposition shall be manifested by Mexico to protract them unreasonably. Under the supposition that such may be the view of the department, [he had not then received the note of Oct. 16th.] *I shall make no movement from this point . . . until further instructions are received.*" — p. 97.

After the receipt of this letter, it became plain that General Taylor was not thus to be caught with chaff. But the American government had yet other advices. On the 23d of September, Mr. Marks, a short time before American consul at Metamoras, wrote a letter to General Taylor — which of course was forwarded to the American government, from which we make the following extract:—

"General Arista, . . . [the Mexican commander,] assured me that there will be no declaration of war on the part of Mexico. . . . General Arista pledged his honor to me that no large body of Mexican troops should cross the left bank of the Rio Grande; that only small parties, not to exceed two hundred men, should be permitted to go as far as the Arroyo Colorado, twenty leagues from the Rio Grande, and that they should be strictly ordered only to prevent Indian depredations and illicit trade. I then had no hesitation in assuring *him that you* [General Taylor] *would not commit any aggressive act against Mexico, or her citizens, and that you would solely maintain the position you at present occupy, at or near the Nueces river. I trust, in having made this assurance to him, . . . it will meet with your approbation and be adhered to, as in a great measure peace depends on your prudent movements in this particular.*"

For very obvious reasons, the American government never published this letter. But what must be done?

True, Mr. Slidell was in Mexico, pretending to negotiate a settlement of all our difficulties with Mexico. He had not been refused by the actual government of Mexico. True, Congress was in session, and might have been consulted, as in the settlement of the Oregon question. Shall the government wait for the result of Mr. Slidell's mission? — No, that was "anticipated," as well it might have been. Shall Congress

be assembled? Quite as little. On the 13th of January, 1846, Mr. Marcy thus writes to the cautious General:—

“I am directed by the President to instruct you *to advance and occupy with the troops under your command, positions on or near the east bank of the Rio del Norte*, as soon as it can be conveniently done. . . . It is not designed, in our present relations with Mexico, that you should treat her as an enemy; but should she assume that character by a declaration of war, or any open act of hostility towards us, *you will not act merely on the defensive.*” — pp. 77, 78.

On the 11th of March, the American army moved from Corpus Christi, and on the 21st, reached the Rio Grande, and took position on its eastern bank, opposite the town of Metamoras. On the 18th of March, Senor Mejia, commander-in-chief of the forces opposed to the Americans, issued his proclamation. In this he says, “It has been reserved for the United States to practise dissimulation, deceit, and the basest treachery, in order, in the midst of peace, to appropriate to herself the territory of a friendly nation, who had honorably confided in the sincerity of her promises, and in the solemnity of her treaties. . . . What hopes, therefore, can the Mexican republic entertain of treating with an *enemy who, at the very moment he endeavours to lull us into security by opening diplomatic negotiations, proceeds to occupy a territory which never could have been the object of the discussion now pending? The limits of Texas are fixed and well known; they have never extended beyond the Nueces.*” — p. 110. The 23d of March, Senor Cardenas sent a letter to General Taylor, protesting against his invasion of the Mexican territory, “without previous declaration of war, and without an explicit announcement of his design.” He speaks of this act as “*contrary to the practice of civilized countries and the clearest principles of the law of nations.*”

On the 12th of April, the Mexican general ordered General Taylor to retire within twenty-four hours, or war would follow. On the 24th of April, General Arista, the Mexican commander-in-chief, informed General Taylor that “he considered hostilities commenced, and should prosecute them,” and on the same day a slight skirmish took place, though on the Mexican soil.

The remaining history is but too well known already. The message of the President, May 11th, 1846, the vote of Congress, the conduct of the democratic party and the whig party

—all these are well known. The President may declare that “war exists by an act of Mexico,” the Congress may vote it to be true; that changes nothing. They cannot create a fact by a vote. It was the American government that made the war; unconstitutionally made a war which is unjust, mean, cowardly, and wicked even amongst wars.

Well said the Mexican commissioners, but a month ago — “We must confess, not without a blush, that we are exhibiting to mankind the scandal of two Christian people, of two republics, in the presence of all the monarchies, mutually doing one another all the harm they can, by disputes about boundaries, when we have an excess of land to people and cultivate on the beautiful hemisphere where Providence caused us to be born.”

Which nation should blush? Let Mr. Calhoun answer. He said, in his speech in the Senate, Feb. 12th, 1847,

“If the annexation of Texas had not taken place, there would have been no war with Mexico, but that annexation was not the cause of the war. *The immediate cause of the war was the marching of our troops from Corpus Christi to the Rio del Norte. If General Taylor had remained with his forces where he was, there would have been no invasion, — there would have been no conflict.*”*

For the statements we have made, we have not relied on the speeches of partisan leaders, delivered for the purposes of a party hostile to the administration; we have not depended on the miserable secrets of conversations, private letters, and cabinet discussions, since public and well-known documents furnish the only sure ground on which we can stand. The American Congress, Representatives and Senate, with unanimity almost unexampled, threw the blame of this iniquity upon the innocent, and declared that the war existed by the act of Mexico. Only fourteen in the House, only two in the Senate, voted against the bill which made this declaration, and which turned the treasure, the talent, the energy, and the life of this terrible American nation against the miserable and distracted people of Mexico. What shall we say of that declaration? It was a lie! War existed by an act of the American government; we think no honest man, informed of the facts, can be so simple as to doubt it. The Mexicans say that the

* But see Senator Benton's speech of Feb. 24th, 1847.

conduct of America is unparalleled in the history of modern nations. Mr. Castillo y Lanzas is here mistaken. It is not wholly so. There is one parallel to our course of aggression upon Mexico. That is the — partition of Poland. While reading anew the public documents relative to this matter, the corresponding points in that infamous parallel have forced themselves upon us. "That," says a distinguished writer on public law, was "the most flagrant violation of natural justice and international law which has occurred since Europe first emerged from barbarism." Over Mexico as over Poland, it was only necessary to stoop, and you could pick up what you would. There, too, was a territorial claim, a pretence for re-annexation. There as here the spoiler feared the interference of England and France, and employed "dissimulation, deceit, and the basest treachery." The manifestoes of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, setting forth their respective claims, are well known; the writings of suppliant slaves, who, at a tyrant's bidding, contended for their country, however bounded, their country, right or wrong — will not soon be forgot. The language of two of the chief-magistrates of America, solemnly written in their messages and sent to Congress, the nation, and the world — language professing the desire of peace, the love of justice and of right, have brought back to our memory the intense irony, cruel and malicious, of the diplomatists of that period. "The courts," says a diplomatic note dictated by the Spoilers, and sent in September, 1773, to the government of the Polish nation, "the courts [that is, of Russia, Prussia, and Austria] are so deeply interested in preserving the peace of Poland, that while they are busy in getting the treaties ready to be signed and ratified, their ministers think they ought not to lose a moment of that interval so precious for the restoration of the order and tranquillity of that kingdom." We need not point out the parallels in the messages of Presidents Tyler and Polk, or in the speeches and resolutions of their sycophants and their slaves. The democrat has learned of the despot, and American Diplomacy, though but a babe, and inexperienced, already rivals her European parents, long ago cradled at Vienna, Moscow, Rome, or Byzantium, rocked by the tyrants of the earth, and now hoary with centuries of crime — treason against mankind.

Shall we pause now, and pass judgment on the conduct of the two administrations most busy in this crime? We have stated the facts. Shall we declaim against such infamy?

We cannot. Our pen falls to the ground ; our lips are silent ; eloquence were folly, genius impotence, in such a work. We pass away from that theme.

"To gild refined gold, to paint the lily,
To throw a perfume on the violet,
To smooth the ice, or add another hue
Unto the rainbow, or with taper-light
To seek the beauteous eye of heaven to garnish —
Is wasteful and ridiculous excess."

What has been the conduct of the famous men of America ? Great Statesmen are the mountains of the world which earliest show the dawn and latest hold the lingering rays of the departing sun ; foremost prophets of the day when morning promises to come ; most conservative of light when darkness shrouds the vulgar plains. But great Politicians are but the steeples of America, whose topmost summit bears — a weather-cock. There are, in America, amongst her children, four famous men. We shall not now discuss their general merits, nor attempt to decide whether they are politicians — who interpret the interests of a party, or statesmen that incarnate principles in a nation's life. These four tower far above the vulgar mass that drive a thriving trade in politics ; are most conspicuous men — beheld far off at sea. They have been long in public life, and all four may be deemed competitors for the chair of the President. What has been their conduct ? Mr. Benton spoke nobly against annexation, and — voted for it. Voted also for the war. Mr. Calhoun, — so oftne superior to party ties, — is the author of annexation, and voted for the war. These two belong to the party in power, and men might have looked for their allegiance. The two others are hostile to the administration : have they been hostile to the war ? Mr. Clay is a private man — and therefore has not been called on to take any official stand in relation to this matter. But in December, 1846, at the celebration of a memorable event in the history of America, he was *toasted* at table, and made a reply, which was thus reported in the newspapers of the time. "Although leading a life of retirement, I am not wholly unobservant of the proceedings relating to the condition, welfare, and prospects of our country. And when I saw around me to-night, Gen. Brooke, and other old friends, *I felt half inclined to ask for some nook or corner in the army, in which I might serve, to avenge the wrongs done to my country. I have thought that I might yet be able to capture or*

slay a Mexican. I shall not be able to do so, however, this year, but hope that success will still crown our gallant arms, and the war terminate in an honorable peace." To add yet more to the shame of America, this speech was delivered at the dinner of the Sons of New England, on the 22d of December, met to celebrate the landing of the Forefathers of New England on Plymouth rock. Poor men! in that puritanic blood of theirs was there no tinge from the heart of the Pilgrims? Could they not, on that day, amid the feasting, the wine, and the revelry, amid the politicians, and the generals, and the "great applause," could they not for a moment think of those outcasts of the world who came in the name of Justice to found a state? Oh, no. How could they think of that? There stood one of the foremost men of America, hoping to "capture or slay a Mexican!" the son of some woman that never injured him—who might go down, heart-broken and refusing to be comforted, in sorrow to her grave. Alas—could he have known it—vain man, how soon is he doomed to weep at the "inscrutable Providence," by which his own son, the dear one, lies slain, in battle—not slain by a great statesman, but by some vulgar bullet of a nameless soldier, who fought for his country, her altars, and her homes, while the American volunteer fell inglorious and disgraced, a willing murderer, in that war so treacherous and so cruel. The father who had hoped to "slay a Mexican," shall find but sad consolation kissing the cold lips of his only son. Is Providence so "inscrutable?" He who would deal death upon the sons of other men—shall he not feel it in his own home?

But the great champion of the north, that man of giant intellect which dwarfs his three competitors to littleness, himself perhaps unequalled among living men in magnificence of understanding—he has stood on Plymouth Rock, and his words which found a footing there have gone as pilgrims to be forefathers of mighty deeds—at least in humbler men! How broke the thunders of that unequalled eloquence, which so oft before had shaken every heart? Did he thunder in the Senate, and lighten all over the land till wondering nations saw it from afar? Let us look at this. He had condemned annexation. "It struck a blow at the influence of our institutions. . . . Thank God I did not slumber over that danger." He had condemned the war; it was "illegal," unconstitutional, unjust; "a war of pretexts," "a presidential war;" the President's action was "an impeachable offence;" the Mexicans were

weak, distracted, the prey of military tyrants. She "has had nothing that deserved to be called a government;" and America is strong and united. In making war, the President had "very much nullified an important provision of the constitution." Yet Mr. Webster could say, at Philadelphia, Dec. 2d, 1846,

"Nevertheless, war is upon us, armies are in the field, navies are upon the sea. We believe that the *government ought immediately, in an honorable and satisfactory manner, to bring the war to a conclusion*, if possible. . . . But while the war lasts, [this unjust and unconstitutional war,] while soldiers are on the land, and seamen on the sea, *upholding the flag of our country, you feel, and I feel, and every American feels, that they must be succoured and sustained*. . . . They have done honor to the country to which they belong. . . . Where can we look for such steadiness, calmness, bravery, and modesty, as in these volunteers! The most distinguished incident in the history of our country—of the good conduct of the militia—of new raised levies from amongst the people, is, perhaps, that of the battle of Bunker Hill. . . . I might go further and say, that *at Bunker Hill the newly raised levies and recruits sheltered themselves behind some temporary defences, but at Monterey the volunteers assailed a fortified city*."*

Nor was that all; but the day before, addressing a body of volunteers, misguided young men who probably had never considered the justice of the war, nor asked whether they were to fight for slavery or freedom—he could cheer and encourage them to fight in a war which he declared "illegal," and threatened to impeach the President for beginning; could bid them go and uphold the stars of their country's banner!

Such was the conduct of that man on whom nature has lavished so prodigally her gifts—a kingly intellect, a heart of noble make." In the Senate what did he to end the war?—to "impeach" the President? Nothing. So far as opposition to the war is concerned—no mouse in the wall could have lain stiller or more snug. All winter he sat in his seat busy—but with other things. The instigators of the invasion passed by and said: "See, Webster is the friend of the war." Had he not a son invested in that enterprise?

Such is the conduct of the four most eminent men of Amer-

* We have followed the report of this speech in Niles's Register. The language in the Pennsylvania Inquirer is a little more intense.

ica. No one of them opposes the war. Does any one say a good word against it—he is sure to eat that word the next day. The war is thought “glorious,” and called “patriotic;” men are bid to fight the war of their country, “right or wrong.” How few remember that to fight on the wrong side is to fight *against* the country. The “glory” of the enterprise, what does it amount to? Why, if the United States were to conquer all Mexico, viewed as a military exploit the glory of the deed would be nothing. As well might the Horseguards at London claim glory because they had chased a crowd of women from Billingsgate, and driven them up Ludgate hill. We make no doubt, that a private company for the conquest of Mexico might be got up in Boston, which in two years’ time would conquer the whole of that country, and keep it—perhaps for ever. The glory which twenty millions of “Anglo-Saxons” are likely to get from conquering the miserable population of Mexico is glory in the wrong column, even when looked at merely with the unscrupulous eyes of a soldier. It seems surprising all men cannot see that such a glory is only a shame. One day the people must awaken. Justice will at last hold a stern reckoning with the memories of our famous men.

But what is the real cause which lay at the bottom of the national design, produced annexation, and made and prosecutes the war for the partition of Mexico? There is a power behind the constitution, but greater than the constitution itself, rising above and projecting beyond it; yes, greater than Congress—overshadowing the “unalienable rights” of man; we mean the institution of domestic slavery. Despotism of the old world are too liberal and enlightened to allow it any longer in their domain. It is cleared off from the soil of western Europe. The Bey of Tunis solemnly says to the world, “It is a very cruel thing, and our heart shrinks from it.” “We have abolished men’s slavery in all our dominions.” “All slaves that shall touch our territory shall become free.” Even Mexico, weak, semibarbarous Mexico, will have no slaves on her soil. But in democratic America it has found an asylum, a home. The egg was laid surreptitiously in the nest of the American Eagle, who now loves its ghastly and hideous disclosure better than all her legitimate brood, whose food that young cormorant devours apace, defiling what is not destroyed. The American Eagle broods over this Harpy with fond delight,

caressing it with beak and wing. For that she plunders the living and tears the dead—slain for its insatiate crew.

The constitution of the United States in spirit and letter defends slavery; the laws are on its side. There is not a state in the Union which dares say with that Mohammedan prince—"All slaves that touch our territory shall become free." Neither political party is opposed to it; both favor, both love it—now with open ardor, now with longings in secret. A resolution refusing to extend the area of slavery is consistently hissed down at a convention of political democrats in the heart of Massachusetts. Scarce a prominent man in the whig party is prominently opposed to this. The great politicians who reach to the upper currents of the popular air all point that way; the little politicians whose stature does not exceed the range of gusts and eddies in the street, tell mainly the same tale. Certainly the politicians of America—the large dealers and the little hucksters of politics—are its friends. They oppose it; how could they? With here and there an exception, the American churches are also on its side, and can quote scripture for *their* purpose, defending it in the name of God. "Southern chivalry," with its boasting tone, and the "morality of the north," with its cringing gait, are united in its defence. The press supports it,—the newspapers, with their thin but continuous talk, and the grave, sober literature, an imitation of English models in all besides—is American only in its support of slavery! It is this which annexed Texas, this which began the war.

Slavery is the idol of America. Men of ablest intellect—who differ on most other matters of national concern—agree in defence of this. But its subtlest apology—as of all evil—is in the name of God. "No man," said Mr. Simms, of South Carolina, in his speech in Congress, "No man who reads his Bible and who is a Christian, . . . can denounce slavery as immoral. . . . The very first steps taken by the French encyclopedists for overthrowing the authority of the Bible was to publish to the world . . . *that slavery was wrong in principle, and then that the Bible was the advocate of slavery.*" "It is founded on the laws of God, written in the climate and soil of the country." "It is your inferior clergy," says an able writer, a "northern man with southern citizenship,"* "that are teaching . . . that slavery is contrary

* See letters in the New York Courier and Enquirer to Hon. George P. Marsh, by "a northern man with southern citizenship."

to the laws of God ;" "you cannot abolish slavery, for *God is pledged to sustain it.*"

The idol is popular ; to refuse its worship is found dangerous ; to oppose it is "fanaticism ;" but to be on its side, to feed it with money and blood, is "honorable," "patriotic," "popular." Well said the father of his country, in his farewell address : "Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the fanatic, are liable to become suspected and odious ; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests."

The slaveholders wanted new territory, for slaves were falling in value on the soil of the old states. In 1839, Mr. Upshur said in the Virginia convention, "If it should be our lot to acquire Texas, . . . *their price will rise.*" In 1842, Mr. Gholson, of the same state, thought "the *acquisition of Texas would raise their price fifty per cent.*" It was feared, or pretended, that Texas might abolish slavery ; so in 1843, Mr. Upshur, then American Secretary of State, wrote officially to our minister in Texas, "the establishment in the very midst of our slaveholding states of an independent government forbidding the existence of slavery, . . . could not fail to produce the most unhappy effects." "There could not be any security for that species of property." Annexation "is absolutely necessary to the salvation of the South." In 1844, he wrote to our minister in England, "If Texas should not be attached to the United States, we cannot maintain that institution [of slavery] ten years, and probably not half that time."

So the South must have Texas, and extend slavery over that soil whence the Mexicans had scourged it out. Could the North prevent it ? Most certainly ; even little New England could have prevented it. Mr. Webster, who gratuitously thanks God that he "did not slumber over that danger," says, "*New England might have prevented it if she would, but her people would not be roused.*"* But, long before, New England learned

"To crook the pregnant hinges of the knee,
That thrift may follow fawning."

The most disinterested enthusiasm of this day—long directed against slavery in general, fought against this special act, and a few noble men spoke loud and long, but to reluctant

* Speech in Faneuil Hall, Nov. 6th, 1846.

ears and cold hearts. Had their counsel been followed, we should have had no annexation, no invasion, no war! But a false idea had gone abroad in New England—that southern slavery is profitable to the North. The “chivalry” and the “morality” have one common affection—not the love of their country, nor the love of Right, but the love of gain! So New England assented to annexation, the North assented, a whig Senate annexing Texas, the fatal dower of slavery in her land, with the expectation of a war. The South has its wish, the North its reward. The Nation laments the violation of her constitution, the debasement of her great men,—it was violated by slavery, and to that her sons have bowed the neck; she beholds the betrayal of her honor,—it was betrayed by slavery; she mourns for thousands of her children slain,—they were murdered by slavery—which clamors still for more. Behold the beginning of the end—which is not the end itself.

ART: II.—POWERS’ GREEK SLAVE.

THE appearance of Mr. Powers’ statue among us, and the feeling of earnest admiration with which it has been received, afford us an occasion to say a few words, not so much with reference to the sculptor and his work, as to Art in general; of which it may be said, that there is no one side of human knowledge concerning which the ideas of men are so vague, varying, and inadequate. To explain what it truly is, to place it in its true relations, to make every man feel that it is of importance to him, and that its concurrence is essential to the highest development of mankind, will be the future work of genius through many ages. If we cannot give a reason for the faith that is in us, we can still protest against skepticism and indifference. It will assist us in our endeavour if we classify the views and feelings with which Art is regarded among men.

I. We have the large class who have no thought on the subject, but to whom music, poetry, or any work of art not beyond the range of their sympathies, is a source of the highest gratification.

II. Those in whom a partial or onesided development has injured the natural balance of the faculties. Thus, the man whose life has been devoted to action in the world, is accustomed to view Art as action without a useful end; or else sees in it only a means of pleasure and sensual gratification. The religionist thinks its influence doubtful or dangerous to the interests of religion and morality.

III. Those persons who are not wanting in a due sense of the value of Art, but who see it only in parts and fragments, or are influenced by fashion, or some dominant mind; and are thus incapable of overseeing it as a whole.

IV. Artists.

We could wish there were a fifth class to be added: but in this age of the world, when we are made familiar with the works of all times, without selection, to oversee the whole, and, through the mass of "works" that obscure it, seize the clear image of Art itself, as the Greeks did, must evidently be granted only to genius, industry, and opportunity, combined. There may be individuals, but hardly a class.

We say, and more or less understandingly we believe, that God made man in his image. What are the attributes that we involuntarily attach to the Supreme Being? Are they not Creation, that originates; Action, that sustains; Love, that environs us, and in which we exist? The life of man is passed in the exercise of these same attributes or faculties. We believe that Religion is love to God and Man. To action man is spurred by necessity, from the first moment of his being; when he ceases to act he is dead. Man lives, and worships; he now feels the necessity to *create*. The natural delight in melody, in imitation, first points out the way; he makes a song; he draws a rude outline, and Art already exists.

This threefold nature of man, religious, practical, and artistic, is rarely if ever confided by nature, in full measure, to the same individual; always the one predominates. And thus we have the Priest, the Poet, and the Man of Action; or, in early times, the man of action *par excellence*—the Soldier; and this is the reason for the fascination that the military profession still retains: the soldier has been in all times the visible type of the man of action. The harmonious development of these three attributes is necessary to the harmonious development of the individual man; which explains that wonderful perfection of development that was found in individuals in the earlier ages; so that whilst the progress has still been towards

the improvement of the race, we can point to no more perfect specimens than the Jews and the Greeks possessed.

In all times it has seemed to be the design of Providence to make some peculiar race the depository of the divine fire of a new idea, or at least, the means of its elaboration and interpretation to mankind; and by the steady progress of the idea in such a race an individual development has been attained, that has served as a model to all after times, and which, in its perfection, always suggests a divine inspiration rather than human progress, if the two things can be separated. Such was the progress of a pure religion among the Jews, of a pure art among the Greeks. In their early progress the two were always most intimately united, but after a certain culminating point had been reached, a separation has taken place; Art became a minister to learning; Religion became narrow and bigoted; until in the hands of another race, and under the influence of new ideas, they have been again united for a time.

In those early times Art was grand and ideal, filled with the dignity of its mission. It has been the property and possession of the people, and not of individuals. The poems of Homer, the early Greek dramas, the Parthenon and its friezes, belonged to every Greek as much as to Pericles; but when its mission was fulfilled, when individuals became the patrons of Art, it lost its high ideal character, and this became its chief aim—to please and interest. Whenever, in later times, Art has resumed a high and ideal position, it has been when, under the influence of dominant ideas, it has spoken to the genius of the people, instead of answering to the narrow demands of patrons. Thus the Art of the Middle Ages achieved its greatness by belonging to the Church, at a time when the Church belonged to the People; for one must always concede to the Catholic Church that it was the representative of the people, when the people had no other representative.

It will be seen that we have spoken principally with reference to imitative art; but our idea of Art includes all poetry, though it is one of the most difficult questions in relation to Art, how far, and in what sense, poetry is an art. A great confusion prevails: in the mind of most men, art in poetry suggests the idea of artifice; men are accustomed to say they prefer nature to art, and though one understands what they mean, the mistake is perpetuated.

Poetry is strictly an art; the first and highest of all the

arts ; subject to the same laws, yet wearing their chains more loosely, from its ethereal nature.

Poetry has this advantage over the other arts, that its expression is immediate ; it speaks out and at once to all the world ; it cannot be made a handmaid of luxury ; its ideal nature, its inspiration, is the means by which it exists. Imitative art has a body, an appearance, which can give pleasure apart from its soul, or inspiration ; but if poetry be not inspired, it is nought. All other arts must be learnt by slow and laborious mechanical means ; the body of imitative or musical art has to be mastered, before the soul can be expressed ; there must be access to the most eminent masters ; but the poet has only to speak, and the world listens.

Now, to a certain extent, the same is true of poetry which we have said of the other arts. The earliest poetry is always religious and ideal in its character, and belongs to the people ; but when all things are in a state of decline, the small class of cultivated men become the heirs and depositaries of those treasures of art which were formerly the free property of all. This age, immediately succeeding what may be called the heroic age of Art, is usually fertile in excellent poets and artists of a secondary class. Living immediately in the presence of works of the highest order, with no bad examples as yet to create a false taste, or lower the standard, such men are in a position to reproduce whatever can be reproduced of the merit of ancient works ; but instead of speaking to a now corrupted people, they address themselves to a small, but admirably cultivated class. As the audience differs, so do the works. Religious awe and reverence have disappeared, or are artificially reproduced ; Poetry becomes more and more artificial ; until a new idea, or a new revelation, calls for new bards and singers.

Following in this course, Art gradually becomes degraded ; thus we have seen poetry become an amusement for learned men, and all kinds of bad taste perpetuated, in a chase after a superficial novelty.

Without entering at this time more fully into particulars of the various renovations and ideas that have infused, from time to time, new blood into the body of Art, we now come to a phase of Art peculiar to our own time.

An earnest, yet complex and self-conscious age, looking diligently for light and aid in all directions, recognizes in its poets and artists a false aim, a want of true inspiration, a

frigidity and artifice resulting from the worn-out traditions of elder schools. It demands a more earnest aim, a greater faithfulness; in a word, a return to Nature. Now this demand is founded in a partial perception of truth, and leads to an error not the less inveterate that it is respectable. It arises from the belief that high Art is but an imitation and selection from exalted Nature; whereas the soul of Art is, as has been said, "Creation in the beautiful." This error appears very natural so long as we regard the imitative arts only; for their faithful imitation being the most obvious, comes to be regarded as the essential requisite. But turn to Architecture; when this art becomes degraded, what Nature can we return to, save the Idea we have in our own mind of the true and beautiful; we are to return not to Nature, but to Art; and this return it is the province of Genius to accomplish. The same is true of Music. If, then, there are arts in which there is no imitation of nature, it follows that this imitation cannot be the essence, but only the form which Art adopts; for the essence of all arts must be the same.

The development of this idea of a return to Nature has been productive of notable effects, both for good and evil; and has formed the interior history of much of the art and literature of the past half century; there are signs that it has run its course, and is giving place to other, perhaps not more complete, ideas. Its effect upon painting is visible in an infinite number of pleasing works, possessing both good taste and refinement, generally in the class of *portrait landscape*; and the apotheosis of the idea may be found in a very singular, eloquent, and even valuable book, called the "Modern Painters, by a graduate of Oxford." In the midst of pages of vivid description of Nature, and refined criticism of works of art, we are startled with the assertion repeated a thousand times, that in the British school of our day, and chiefly in one member of this school, resides all that is most valuable in landscape. The error is simply this; that in a certain phase of Landscape Art the English have accomplished things never done nor attempted before. That this phase is not the highest, and that the author with a vivid insight into a part, is incapable of a just view of the whole, would seem probable, even to one who did not know what the English school has accomplished.

In the domain of Poetry the consequences of the dominant idea of return to Nature have been still more striking. All

nature has been ransacked. The poet has rushed to field, wood, and waterfall, and sat down before them to muse, with as much set purpose as the painter does to sketch. The vocabulary being once adjusted, and the general tone of thought and sentiment prescribed, making poetry has become so easy that it is done as a matter of course ; every body can sit down before a waterfall ; every tenth man can put his " Impressions " into verse ; every hundredth can get them printed ; the general taste becomes corrupted, sentiment mawkish, language exaggerated. And yet the leaders of this school have been great men, and, in spite of a false theory, have done good work in their time.

Another phase in Modern Art has been the reverse of this. Perceiving the religious nature of high Art, certain men of devout mind have taken as their model that period in Art when its aim was purely religious and ideal. Such has been the tendency of the modern German school of Painting. The result has been to reproduce the faults and shortcomings which were excusable in those early masters, from their imperfect knowledge, without reproducing the deep feeling which atones for them.

The consideration of these various stages of perfection, decline, and renovation, more or less successful, suggests the existence of laws by which they are governed, and the more we examine the subject, the more universal we find the application of these laws to be ; we are made aware of the dependence of the artist on his time ; and we become conscious that through his works the genius of the time speaks to us ; more or less perfectly, indeed, according to the perfection of its interpreter. We arrive at the conviction, that where the genius of a people needs an expression, individual genius will never be wanting to give it utterance. We learn that it is with reason, that the works of art produced by a nation are instinctively appealed to, as the finest test of the rank they are entitled to among the nations. We learn, also, or should learn, this—not to expect or demand of artists a work analogous to Greek, or Italian, or any other art, but rather to look and hope for an artistic expression in new directions. Among the Greeks we have seen Poetry, Painting, Sculpture, Architecture, all developed and carried to perfection in a single period of time, and among a single people. In modern times, on the contrary, each nation and age have chosen a new and separate direction. The genius of Germany finds at one period an

expression in Gothic architecture, at another in a grand and original music. One might almost believe that an original architecture could only spring up among a simple and devout people, of an unmixed race; but that a perfect expression in music requires the full development of an older people. We may remark, moreover, that as we find the religious, the artistic, and the active principles developed in different individuals, so is it with nations, in an observable degree. The Jews were a religious race, the interpreters of the revelations of God to man; the Greeks artistic. The Romans, the great active race of antiquity, borrowed their Art; the English and French, the great active races among the moderns, have originated very little in Art; save only in Poetry, the art of arts, which is least subject to these laws. May not this continent see a development of the English race in which the three parts of our nature shall not be so widely separated; and a new art spring from a new order of things?

To recur to our classification of admirers and critics of Art; we can perceive that our first great class is the most important to Art. The finished connoisseur may know and appreciate all that is best in what has gone before us in Art, and his province is to interpret it, and spread its refining influence through the world; but when a new Art springs up it has always to educate new and fresh minds to an understanding of itself; and thus we see in all such cases renewed the ancient strife between new and old. Just in proportion as Art springs from and appeals to the genius of a people, it will be high and ideal in its character; whilst Poetry, or works of art that appeal to a cultivated audience, will always be elegant and conventional; though it must be conceded that the period of transition, if it have never produced the greatest, has often given birth to the most exquisite and pleasing, works.

In our age no man is satisfied to admire and be instructed, but all must judge and criticize. This being so, a conscientious mind will still prescribe to itself certain rules;—for human judgment, if once it leaves the region of instinct, can be trusted only by reference to principles.

The first natural question is, how does this please *me*? But we are already in danger, for how do you know that what pleases yourself is good and true? Your taste may be corrupted. Your feeling may demand something false and exaggerated.

The next step is to compare. But still we are in danger.

Things of the same kind may be compared, but an original work of art is different in *kind* from any thing that has gone before. The Venus de Medici and Mr. Powers' statue cannot be compared, except in certain external particulars; for they express ideas as different as possible; ideas different in kind.

Where, then, lies the difficulty? Simply in this; that supposing a work to be a true work, and a new work to us, we approach it in a false position when we come to criticize it. We should come to learn from it, and to admire it. We criticize because we are afraid we shall admire amiss. We are not simple-minded; we are afraid of being taken in to admire something not admirable. Only make it certain to men that they can make no mistake in admiring, and admiration may be had cheap. This hasty criticism is always the fault of the partially cultivated class.

Most artists will in their hearts admit, that contemporary criticism is for the most part worthless in itself, and injurious to the artist who listens to it. He must know better than his audience, or he knows nothing.

We believe that it is a difficult matter to criticize aright. What is left us? To each man his suffrage and nothing more. But let each one remember, in giving that suffrage, that to a clear and instructed eye his opinion shows plainly enough his own range of apprehension and insight; but can show nothing of the relative value of the work, with reference to other works.

In brief, our advice would be, on seeing a new work which you believe to be an important one—take time. Try to *see* it. Do not think it incumbent upon you to think or feel about it. Do not dwell upon it long at a time, for the attention becomes fatigued; but return frequently, and each time you will find that you understand it better since you last saw it. It has been with you in the interval. It has lived with you, and educates you to itself. And when you have learned from it all it can teach you, write down your thought about it, and see how impossible to compass it in words; how paltry and insignificant criticism at sight seems to you!

It is only works which we have thus lived with that we can truly criticize; and such criticism is very different from finding fault. If a work is not worth this, it may be worthy of consideration, but not of criticism.

Can we hold ourselves guiltless, if after this we say a few words concerning the statue which suggested our subject?

What do we demand when an American man, of this century, takes hammer and chisel, and gives us in white marble his idea of a lovely woman? Certainly not a Grecian goddess; but Woman, such as two thousand years, and the Christian religion, have made her since; a modern woman. Not an exquisite generalization of all that is most lovely in the female form, to stand boldly in the public gaze and receive the homage of all worshippers; but rather, an ideal individual. The ancient Venus suggests no need of dress; but we feel that this woman has laid aside her dress and is conscious of it, yet she stands the image of chastity. Her purity awes you like the Lady in Comus. The form is full of individualities, all blending in an exquisite whole, and by the very peculiarities which strike the eye as differing from the Greek ideal, claiming our affection and sympathy.

We learn that this is a slave, exposed for sale in the market-place; and supposing her a captive, torn from her home, we can imagine few scenes that shall call for so much pity, admiration, and tenderness; all these feelings must be called forth in the highest degree, but yet, pervading all, and beyond all these, the sense of Beauty must everywhere be satisfied. And so it is; and indeed most persons go away with the idea that they have been called upon to see and admire nothing but a beautiful naked female figure. But visit it again and again, and you will find this marble figure steals gradually into your affections. There is no theatrical air, no forcing of the story upon you, no open demand of your sympathies; you see before you only this exquisitely delicate form, self-dependent, armed only with its purity, and needing no other shield than this in the most touching of all situations.

We close with the hope that our artist has ere this received tangible demonstration that he can depend upon the growing taste and love of Art in his own countrymen both for praise and bread.

ART. III.—THE POLITICAL CONDITION AND PROSPECTS OF GREECE.

THE independence of Greece is one of the most glorious events in the European history of the nineteenth century. The success of the revolution against Mohammedan domination reflects honor both on the Greek nation and on the human race; but the actual political condition of the Hellenic kingdom is the disgrace of European statesmanship. France, Great Britain, and Russia combined to transform a republic into a monarchy, and their creation commenced in misgovernment, and promises to end in anarchy.

The discordant statements published from time to time concerning the condition of the Greek people, and the adverse opinions offered on the conduct of the Greek government, induce us to believe that we can render some service to our fellow-citizens by presenting them with an impartial description of the new monarchy, freed from the false coloring of French and English diplomacy. To us, the cause of Greece is one of the deepest interest, but, separated as we are from the political intrigues of eastern Europe, we cannot feel any very lively concern about the party contests at the Greek court. This very circumstance may perhaps enable us to establish some landmarks of truth amidst the haze of misrepresentation which hangs over Greek affairs. To us, King Otho, General Colletti, Prince Mavrocordato, Monsieur Piscatory, Pair de France, and Sir Edmund Lyons, Baronet—the five leading political characters in Greece—are only interesting as their actions affect the political and social condition of the Greek people. Pisistratus, Themistocles, Phocion, Æmylius Paulus, and Mummius only occupy a different position in our minds because their reputations cast a wider and brighter light.

It is not our intention to say any thing at present concerning the Greek revolution.* The citizens of the United States

* The best work on the subject of the war with the Turks is the "*History of the Greek Revolution*, by Thomas Gordon, F. R. S." 2 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh. 1832. Mr. Gordon of Cairness was a gentleman of considerable fortune, who had spent much of his youth in the east, and was well acquainted with Turkish as well as Greek literature. He repaired to join the Greeks with a supply of arms and ammunition as soon as the revolution broke out. He died in 1842, at his estate of Cairness in Scotland, holding the rank of Major-General in the Greek service. His work is universally regarded as the best authority on Greek affairs, on account of his freedom from all party feelings.

gave substantial proofs of their good wishes for the cause, by the abundant aid they furnished to Greece in the hour of her greatest peril. Many fought and several perished in her service; and in 1827, the supplies of provisions poured into Greece from America, cargo after cargo, contributed to prolong the desperate struggle until the tardy assistance of European diplomacy terminated the war. Those who witnessed the utter destitution of the people at the period when the American supplies reached the country, can alone form an idea of the dreadful state of misery to which the population was reduced. Thousands of families were saved from starvation,—and we here mean, not from a lingering death brought on by want and its concomitant diseases,—but literally,—from perishing by immediate and absolute starvation. Even in spite of the arrival of these supplies, famine had already made such progress, that the fearful spectacle of death from hunger has been witnessed by more than one of our countrymen who visited the provinces of Greece to distribute these cargoes. Our present task is only to review the state of affairs from the time the three great powers of Europe, France, Great Britain, and Russia, determined to assume the protection of Greece; and to examine in what manner they have executed the trust they assumed. The work of the most celebrated ministers in Europe is a study worthy of profound attention.

The first interference of the three protecting powers was to assume an authority to mediate with Turkey, by a treaty signed at London on the 6th of July, 1827. That treaty was followed by the battle of Navarino, in which the allies destroyed a considerable part of the Turkish fleet, and frightened the British ministry to such a degree, by the damage inflicted on their old friend the Sultan, that the victory was called in a fit of remorse “an untoward event.” The dictatorship of Capodistrias, the election of Prince Leopold of Saxe Coburg (now King of Belgium) to be prince sovereign of Greece, his sudden resignation, and the perplexities of a mass of protocols, kept Greece for some years in a state of political disorder as injurious to the population as the war itself.*

* The treaties and protocols, as well as some financial papers and correspondence, have been printed for the British Parliament. This collection of papers on the affairs of Greece, from 1827 to 1844, embraces five folio volumes. The most important documents, from 1827 to 1833, were printed at the Greek Government press. This small but valuable collection is entitled *Recueil des Traités, actes, et pièces concernans la fondation de la Royauté en Grèce*. Nauplie. 1833. 8vo.

In the year 1831, the assassination of Count Capodistrias converted disorder into anarchy. Insurrection spread over the whole country, and the authority of the existing government was confined to the walls of Nauplia. Civil war laid waste the rest of Greece. Each military leader endeavoured to collect round him a band of followers strong enough to retain possession of a province capable of nourishing his troops. The dispossessed united to attack the successful. The sufferings of the agricultural population amidst this scene of anarchy, were dreadful; for the poor peasantry, cheered by the comparative tranquillity of Capodistrias's administration, had recommenced cultivating the soil; and they now saw the relics of their property, after escaping the Turks and Egyptians, destroyed by their own countrymen. While the irregular troops were engaged in destroying the resources of the Greek state, the three protecting powers were searching in all the royal nurseries of Europe to find a king for the Greeks.

It cannot be supposed that the fate of the Greek people was really a matter of indifference to the governments of France, Great Britain, and Russia, but still, we may doubt whether three statesmen more indifferent than Prince Talleyrand, Lord Palmerston, and Prince Lieven, to the sufferings of a rude peasantry, ever assembled to decide on the fate of nations. At all events, it is quite certain that they took no direct steps to prevent the civil war in Greece from thinning the population and diminishing the resources of the monarchy they were engaged in founding; though nothing could have been easier.

On the 7th of May, 1832, a convention between the three powers and the king of Bavaria was signed, appointing his second son, Prince Otho, king of Greece. This treaty is a singular document. It gives the king of Bavaria power to nominate a regency of foreigners, to send a corps of foreign troops and a host of foreign officials to Greece. Yet it was notorious that Greece possessed statesmen fit enough for regents, though not for legislators or organizers: Colletti, Mavrocordato, and Metaxas were just as well known then, as now;—and that there were far too many armed men and hungry officials in the country, was attested by the unceasing civil war and incessant intrigues. Every body exclaimed that Greece wanted nothing but order, and the three powers deliberately set to work augmenting the causes of disorder. To guard against the evil effects of the failure of their speculation recoiling upon themselves, France, Great Britain, and Russia

imposed on the Greek people, by the twelfth article of this treaty, (to which it is to be observed that Greece was not directly a party,) a debt of sixty millions of francs, which was to be disposed of by the parties to the convention; and they created in their own favor an hypothecation of the revenues of the new kingdom for the payment of the interest to fall due on this debt. The whole transaction was utterly illegal, according to every principle of public or common law; and it is strange to find the ministers of France and England, in the very act of founding a new monarchy, trampling under foot the most indispensable characteristic of free states; namely, that no financial burdens shall be imposed on the people without their express consent. To increase the illegality of the imposition, the expenditure of these millions was placed at the disposal of Bavarians ignorant both of the wants and resources of Greece; and the Greeks were excluded from any knowledge of the manner in which it was proposed to employ it. We must further observe, that in this treaty founding the Greek kingdom, not one word is said concerning the lives and property of the Greeks, their civil institutions, or political constitution. Greece and the Greeks were placed at the absolute disposal of a despotic regency.

As it was suspected by the protecting powers that the Greek people would make a vigorous protest against this disposal of their lives and fortunes without their consent, instructions were transmitted to the representatives of the allies in Greece, ordering these gentlemen to obtain a ratification of the treaty as quickly as possible from some body of men having the usual characteristics of a government *de facto*. In order to show our readers into what a labyrinth of diplomatic tergiversation the illegal provisions of the convention involved the allies, we must transcribe one article of these instructions verbatim. The residents of France, Great Britain, and Russia, are ordered "to declare that the choice of Prince Otho was made by the three courts in virtue of a *formal* and *unlimited* authorization on the part of the Greek nation; that consequently, the three courts had a right to make that choice, and are all strictly obliged and firmly resolved to maintain it."* The fact, how-

*The instructions will be found in *Protocols of Conferences held in London, relative to the affairs of Greece, presented to both houses of Parliament by command of His Majesty.* 1832. Annex A to the protocol (51) on the conference of the 25th of July, 1832, p. 178.

ever, is, that no such formal and unlimited authorization ever existed; if it had, the three courts would have been eager to quote it, in authentic form, in the convention. The necessity of the case was their real warrant for interfering in Greek affairs, and the idea of converting the Greek republic into a German kingdom originated in their own political sagacity. It would, on the whole, have been wiser and more statesmanlike to have told the plain truth in the official papers, instead of seeking to veil their folly in diplomatic fables.

When the Greeks heard that their country had been transformed into a kingdom, they formed a national assembly, which met at Pronia, the suburb of Nauplia, in July, 1832. The deputies displayed so much respect for the constitutional liberties of their country, that the representatives of the three powers were alarmed at their proceedings. These gentlemen consequently addressed a collective note to the secretary of state for foreign affairs in the *de facto* government, which is preserved in the archives of Greece as a proof of the contempt of France and Great Britain for constitutional liberty.* The activity of Mr. Dawkins, the English minister, and the desertion of their country's cause by the great statesmen of the English party, enabled the members of the provisional government to dissolve the national assembly of Pronia by military violence. When it was found that a majority of the members were determined to defend the liberty of their country with firmness, a band of irregular troops was excited to enter the assembly and eject the deputies. Even after this act of military violence, sixty-two deputies had sufficient courage to assemble in another place and publish a protest against the conduct of the provisional government. This protest represents with great force the danger Greece incurred from the continuance of anarchy, and pointed out with justice that the intrigues of the residents of the allied powers were as much the cause of the existing disorders as the lawless violence of the irregular soldiery.† The deputies had been allowed time to ratify the election of King Otho, but they had neither ratified nor approved of the other articles of the convention.

* The letter of the residents is printed in the excellent work of Professor Thiersch, of Munich,—*De l'état actuel de la Grèce, et des moyens d'arriver à sa restauration*. Leipsig. 1838. 2 vols. 8vo.—See Vol. I., p. 407.

† This document, which is of some length, will be found translated in Thiersch, Vol. I., p. 421.

From this moment a struggle for constitutional liberty was commenced by the Greek nation, against the united power of the allied courts and the king of Bavaria. The first act of this great national contest was the desertion of liberal principles by the partisans of British influence, under the guidance of Mr. Dawkins. This party had obtained possession of the principal ministerial offices in the provisional government, and in their eagerness to retain power, its members sacrificed the interests of the Greek people to the intrigues of foreign diplomacy. Their apostasy is boldly announced in an official report signed by Mavrocordato, Tricoupis, Zographos, and Clonares, in which they make their responsibility to a foreign king paramount to their duty to the constitution of their country.* From this period, the faction in Greece called the English party, though consisting of many respectable men, has always been regarded by the constitutionalists with considerable distrust, and indeed, the frequent desertion of their principles for place has prevented them from recovering the reputation they then forfeited. In their defence it has been sometimes urged, that the majority of the national assembly of Pronia consulted private interests in the line of conduct it pursued; this may or may not be true, but it is certain that the partisans of English diplomacy consulted their interests both more openly and more profitably. The real secret of the hostility of Great Britain to constitutional liberty in Greece, at this time, lay, perhaps, less in any decided aversion to liberty, or any very strong attachment to King Otho, than in a pitiful fear that a free election of deputies would give a majority to the Capodistrian party.

In consequence of the intrigues of the allied powers, and the incapacity of the provisional government, Greece remained in a state of anarchy, until the arrival of King Otho and the Bavarian regency, in 1833. Unfortunately for Greece, there was only one member of the regency who was sincerely attached to constitutional liberty; but, fortunately for her, he was the only one who possessed any legislative talents. This man was George Lewis Maurer, and he is now a member of the liberal cabinet lately formed by the king of Bavaria. Almost all the good Greece has derived from the creation of the monarchy, is to be attributed to the legislative and ad-

* The document is printed by Thiersch, Vol. I., p. 412.

ministrative labors of Mr. Maurer. An excellent organization of the courts of justice and an admirable code of civil procedure still attest his merit. The heads of his colleagues were filled with very different ideas. The grand executive act by which Count Armansperg, the president of the regency, announced his arrival in Greece,—the first stroke of his policy,—was to issue a royal ordonnance declaring that two Bavarian lions crowned and rampant,—probably on account of the loan,—were to be the supporters of the arms of the Greek kingdom. The introduction of the paraphernalia of monarchy followed, and, in a short time, the Greeks had exchanged their dirty kilts, or fustinellos, for uniforms, embroidered jackets, lace, ribbons, crosses, and stars. Many absurdities were daily committed, but no absurdity committed in Greece, not even in the expenditure of the loan, was equal to the absurdity of Talleyrand, Palmerston, and Lieven, who put the money at the disposal of the regency before its members were acquainted with the wants of Greece. Mr. Maurer was unable to keep himself free from party connections, and he attached himself, perhaps, too closely to the French party. His enemies availed themselves ably of all his errors, and the king of Bavaria was induced to recall him. He ceased to be a member of the regency on the 31st of July, 1834.*

From August, 1834, to the 14th of February, 1837, Greece was governed by Count Armansperg, an amiable and accomplished diplomatist, who imposed on the Greeks by assuming the air of a *grand seigneur*. His policy, however, was rather directed to maintaining himself in place, by securing a predominant influence to British diplomacy, than either to advancing or retarding the social and political improvement of Greece. It was by this very indifference to principle, that during his administration, the abuses of the Bavarian system

* Mr. Maurer, after his return to Germany, published a work on the state of Greece, which, besides a defence of his administration, contains much valuable information: *Das Griechische Volk in öffentlicher, kirchlicher, und privatrechtlicher Beziehung vor und nach dem Freiheits-Kampfe*. Heidelberg. 1835. 3 vols. 8vo. There is also an English work which throws much light on this period, but it labors under the disadvantage of presenting every thing distorted by a violent fit of Russophobia: "*The Diplomatic History of the Monarchy of Greece, from the year 1830*," by H. H. Parish, Esq., late Secretary of Legation to Greece." London. 1838. 8vo. An account of the state of Greece under Count Armansperg's administration will also be found in a pamphlet, entitled, *The Hellenic Kingdom, and the Greek Nation*, by George Finlay, Author of "Greece under the Romans." London. 1836.

were carried to their greatest height. The number of Bavarians in Greece was never so great as during the period of his supremacy in the regency, and political corruption and jobbing reached their acme in every department, during his administration as chancellor. In order to strengthen his position, many Greeks were admitted to share the profits of his system, so that his administration undoubtedly acquired a certain degree of sinister popularity. The finances of Greece were, however, kept under the control of Bavarians, and the real finance minister could not speak a word of Greek, and hardly two of French. A council of state was also formed. This institution was undoubtedly a step in the right direction, though it was made into the mud; for it must be observed, that this council was composed, not of men capable of being of any use as counsellors, but only of those whom it was of some importance to gain as supporters. Their votes were secured by large salaries, and by the power which the Count retained in his own hands of removing them at pleasure, if they displayed constitutional sympathies. An absolute government can never avoid resorting to intimidation. Attempts were made to restrain the liberty of the press, and a disposition was manifested to commence a persecution of the orthodox, or, as it was called—to render it unpopular—the Russian party. The preacher Germanos, who was editor of a religious newspaper at Athens, was exiled by Count Armanberg to a monastery in Skiathos, and in this way, his newspaper was suppressed. Sir Edmund Lyons, a captain in the British navy, and a man of popular manners, was sent by Lord Palmerston as British minister, with instructions to support the system of the Count to the utmost. Sir Edmund Lyons has continued to represent Great Britain ever since at the court of Athens, and has taken a leading position in Greek politics. His first appearance in diplomacy was as the supporter of the Bavarians and the foreign *camarilla*, and as the staunch opponent of a representative government, on the usual diplomatic pretext, that Greece was not fit for a constitution.*

* There is a curious despatch containing a rather fulsome eulogium of the Count's administration, in the *Parliamentary Papers, presented to Parliament August, 1836*, p. 37. Among a number of inaccurate statements, it is said, "that not one Bavarian has landed in Greece to fill a place under government, since the king's majority." Now, if this were literally correct, there would be no great merit in it, as Count Armanberg had been absolute sovereign of Greece for more than a year previously, as president of the regency, with two ciphers as colleagues, and during that time he had brought a number of his creatures

The lavish expenditure of Count Armansperg brought Greece into financial difficulties, and the king of Bavaria recalled him, as he had done Mr. Maurer. Mr. Rudhardt was sent as his successor, but Rudhardt resigned his office of prime minister, in the month of December, 1837, and his resignation put an end to the open supremacy of the Bavarians in the Greek cabinet.

From the 20th of December, 1837, to the 15th of September, 1843, the cabinet was almost entirely composed of Greeks, though King Otho continued to employ a number of private secretaries, chiefly Bavarians, to control the acts of his ostensible ministers, and thus gave a permanent existence to the *camarilla* established by Count Armansperg. It is not necessary to enter into any details concerning the political conduct of the various cabinets, from the termination of the Bavarian supremacy to the establishment of constitutional liberty, in 1843. During this period, national feelings gained strength so rapidly, that the ministers of the allied powers were in turns compelled to appear as the friends of a representative system. While Bavarian domination received the unqualified support of Great Britain, France whispered a few words in favor of the constitution. When Mr. Chrestides presided over the Greek cabinet, under the auspices of France, Great Britain loudly preached revolutionary doctrines; and when Mavrocordato assumed the direction of affairs, in 1841, on anti-constitutional principles, with the joint support of France and England, Russia stepped forward as the advocate of Grecian liberty.

Let us now pause for a moment from the ungrateful task of recording the tortuous course of diplomatic intrigue, and turn to the more agreeable duty of tracing the progress of the Greek people. The year 1833 found the population of Greece, according to the unexceptionable testimony of Professor Thiersch, in a state of such destitution, that the proprietors and farmers were without cattle to till their lands. The scanty harvest of the year was, in a great part, the produce of manual labor. Every town in Greece was in ruins; Argos, which had been rebuilt under Capodistrias's government, had been

from Bavaria, and, among others, Mr. Frey, who did more injury to the finances of Greece, than any other foreigner. It is true, this was not done "since the king's majority." It would be easy to produce many other facts as contrary to the spirit of the despatch.

again destroyed; the colony of Greek refugees, established by Dr. Howe, at the isthmus of Corinth, was burnt to the ground; Athens, and the whole island of Eubœa, having remained in the hands of the Turks, were almost desolate; the schools established by Capodistrias were dissolved, and the regular army had melted away. The king arrived, and the support of the three powers restored order; immediately, every man sought to rebuild his house, and every agriculturist to procure a pair of oxen; the price of labor rose to the most extravagant pitch, and the interest of money advanced to four per cent. a month. The second volume of the work of Professor Thiersch treats of the measures which the regency was bound to adopt, in order to alleviate, as much as possible, the evils under which Greece was suffering. He discusses the means of improving the condition of the agricultural population, of restoring industry, of reviving commerce, and of ameliorating the moral and intellectual state of the people. The practical experience of the governments of Great Britain and Russia in administering the affairs of thinly peopled and partially organized territories, induced the enlightened men in Greece to suppose that the subject must be one well understood by the ministers of these courts, and it was concluded they would communicate their advice to the regency and King Otho. The work of Professor Thiersch, however, proved useless to his countrymen; and the advice of the ministers of Great Britain and Russia, had they been really competent to give any, would have been rendered of no avail, by their joining the opposition shortly after the arrival of the regency. Indeed, the way in which the affairs of Greece were treated by king, regency, and foreign ministers, affords convincing proof, that practical knowledge of statesmanship is as rare among diplomatists in the nineteenth century, as it was in the seventeenth, when their verbal astuteness and magnificent pretensions drew from the Swedish chancellor, Oxenstiern, the celebrated reply to his son: *Mi fili, parvo mundus regitur intellectu.*

The advances made by the Greeks in social improvement previously to the year 1843, were almost entirely due to their own individual exertions. The little assistance they derived from their own government was unwillingly and ungraciously accorded, and any succour they received from foreigners has been vaunted rather more than it deserves. While King Otho obtained, or, to speak perhaps more correctly, seized a civil list

of two hundred thousand dollars a year, out of a revenue of two millions of dollars, and Count Armansperg allowances to the amount of thirty thousand dollars, and other Bavarians ten thousand dollars each; while orders of knighthood and crosses and stars of silver, gold, and diamonds were lavished on Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Russians; while the interest of money was at eighteen per cent., on the best security, and the consuls of the European powers were accumulating fortunes as usurers,—no step was taken by the Greek government to alleviate the general distress or to improve the social condition of the people. In consequence of this neglect, the population of the kingdom soon suffered a considerable reduction; immense numbers of emigrants from Psara, Chios, Crete, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia, and Constantinople, were compelled to quit Greece, in which they were unable to settle, as the government refused to sell sites for houses in the towns and villages, and exacted exorbitant rents for the national lands that lay still uncultivated.

All the oppressive regulations of the Turkish system of taxation were retained by the king's government, and their severity was rendered more stringent by farming the tithes under the revenue laws of Europe. Tribunals consisting of government officials were alone competent to decide on cases affecting the taxes, which were withdrawn from the cognizance of the regular courts of law. The farmers of the revenue received unlimited powers to regulate the proceedings of the cultivator during the harvest, so that every proprietor who attempted to introduce an improved system of agriculture was liable to extortion on the ground that he had violated the revenue laws. The consequence was, that almost every improver was ruined or compelled to abandon his attempt. No cultivator, though residing at a distance from any village, could reap a field of corn, thresh out his grain, or house his crop, without a separate permission for each operation from the farmer of the revenue; and, after all, he was compelled to transport the tenth which fell to the share of the farmer a day's journey, to such magazines as the farmer might appoint. The nine tenths belonging to the cultivator of the soil became merely an adjunct of the one tenth claimed by government, and were treated by the Greek government as a fund for insuring it against diminution. The consequence of this system on the agriculture of Greece may be seen from the windows of King Otho's palace at Athens. The land round the royal garden is cultivated

in a ruder and more unprofitable manner than in the wildest province of the Ottoman empire.

The commerce of Greece was treated with as little intelligence as the agriculture. Injudicious navigation laws exposed the Greeks of the Hellenic kingdom to be involved in commercial hostility with the Greek subjects of the Ottoman empire. Absurd sanitary regulations hampered the coasting trade of the kingdom, which is composed almost entirely of coast; the internal navigation was abandoned to Austrian and French steamers; and the sailors of Hydra and Psara were compelled to pass half their time in idleness, or seek employment in Turkey.

The moral, intellectual, and religious culture of the nation was almost as much neglected by the government as the agricultural and commercial interests of the people. It is true, that Mr. Maurer, during his administration, took some steps to organize a complete system of national education, but the subject did not meet with due attention from his successors. Unfortunately, too, Mr. Maurer himself adopted some rash measures with regard to the Greek Church, which arrested the progress of religious education.

The state of things we have described gradually produced a deep-rooted hatred of the Bavarian monarchy. Though the prime minister of Greece was no longer a Bavarian, still, the military service and the court were filled with Bavarians, who held all the best appointments. An occurrence during the visit King Louis of Bavaria paid to his son, King Otho, will afford some idea of the justice of the feelings of the Greeks. At a levee, the king of Bavaria asked a pragmatist colonel in the Greek service, "What rank did you hold in my service, before you came to Greece, Colonel?" The reply was, "Sire, I was a lieutenant." "Good, good, very good," said the Bavarian monarch, and moved on, for the promotion seemed rather too rapid. The king then addressed a fine-looking, tall captain, whose broad visage and light hair spoke his Teutonic descent: "Well, Captain, and what rank did you hold in Bavaria?" "Your majesty, I was a corporal," was the delighted answer, proclaimed in a stentorian voice and accompanied with a self-sufficient smile. The monarch looked rather blank, but turning sharply round to a young captain with an aristocratic name and some ribbons and crosses on his breast, that seemed to speak of service in the field, he again risked the royal stereotyped inquiry, "Well, Baron, what rank did you hold at

Munich?" "Sire, I was then at the military academy," was the modest reply. "Thunder and storms," whispered his majesty to his own aide-de-camp, "it is not safe asking questions here in Greece; but if the Greeks are promoted as rapidly as the Bavarians, no doubt Sir Edmund Lyons is quite right, and every body must be vastly pleased with Count Armandsparg's administration, except, perhaps, the parties who may think of paying the loan he is spending."

A short time after the Bavarians were driven from their supremacy in Greece, the Russian party acquired a predominant influence. The discovery of a secret society which embraced many Russian partisans both in Greece and Turkey, was adroitly used by the British minister to exclude them from power, by creating a serious alarm in the mind of King Otho concerning their ulterior projects. This secret association was called the "Philorthodox Society," and it acquired a considerable degree of celebrity from the British cabinet affecting to believe that both the Greek monarchy and the Turkish empire were exposed to imminent danger by its intrigues.

The British minister would in all probability have recovered his influence at the Greek court, after this discovery, had the mind of King Otho not been deeply prejudiced against British policy by a series of the most violent personal attacks that were ever made on the character of a reigning prince. Almost immediately after the recall of Count Armandsparg, a number of letters began to appear in the *London Morning Chronicle*, then generally regarded as the organ through which the foreign office communicated its opinions and prejudices to the public. Though these letters were utterly destitute of the polished and pointed style of the famous invectives of Junius, they displayed in their incorrect and ill-constructed sentences all the fierce and malignant passions of the secret libeller, and the same preference of sarcasm to truth. King Otho was the great object of hostility, and the attacks were rather directed against his person with the intention of wounding his feelings, than against the nature of his despotic power for the purpose of improving the constitution of Greece. The letters appeared as communications from a correspondent at Athens, but it was soon evident in Greece that they originated in diplomatic circles, where many things were known of which the people of Athens had not the smallest idea. As the correspondence was extensively disseminated by the British legation and British consuls in Greece, it soon began to excite great attention.

From one step to another, the correspondence reached its climax, by declaring that King Otho was "an idiot," and that a certificate had been signed by a number of Bavarians about the court, declaring his incapacity, and the names of several persons holding high offices in the king's palace were published as having signed the certificate. The news produced a ferment at Athens, and caused the dismissal of two of the Bavarians accused by the anonymous writer, from their offices at court. Conjectures were risked concerning the real source of the correspondence, but the mystery of the writer has never been revealed. The effects of the attacks on King Otho have, however, been visible ever since, in the uneasy position occupied by the British minister at the Greek court. King Otho, not without justice, considers himself grossly insulted, both by the publication of the correspondence in a ministerial paper, and by the publicity given to the correspondence by the agents of the British government in Greece; and he holds Sir Edmund Lyons and Lord Palmerston responsible, as many of the facts could never have become public without the sanction of one of these ministers.

The effect in Greece was also injurious to the English party. Some of the Greeks, disgusted with the conduct of the court, inferred that the British cabinet had determined to dethrone King Otho, and imprudently embarked in anti-dynastic intrigues. The personal hostility between King Otho and Sir Edmund Lyons became a marked feature in Greek politics. A section of the constitutional party began to plot the dethronement of King Otho, and the royalists demanded the recall of Sir Edmund Lyons. Both parties failed, but the astuteness displayed by the king of Greece in the long diplomatic struggle he has carried on with a minister of the acknowledged talents and great popularity of Sir Edmund Lyons, has afforded the world ample proof of his capacity to reign in the way most unfavorable to British influence.

This unfortunate discord proved very injurious to the progress of Greece. When the cry of the Greek people for constitutional government, as the only means of alleviating the burdens under which they suffered, became so loud as to alarm the court, King Otho, distrusting the projects of Great Britain and Russia, both of whom he seems to have suspected of designs to dethrone him, threw himself into the arms of France, and trusted blindly to its support. A revolution was evidently impending. Great Britain and Russia united in pressing for

explanations concerning the financial position of the Greek government, and the king, in his embarrassment, adopted the most injudicious measures of economy, making extensive retrenchments among the Greeks in order to maintain all the overpaid Bavarian officers, officials, and courtiers about the palace. The consequence was a revolution headed by the Greek military, on the 15th of September, 1843. King Otho was compelled to proclaim the constitution which had been in abeyance since the dispersion of the deputies at Pronia, and convoke a national assembly.

It is generally supposed that both the English and Russian ministers at Athens regarded the dethronement or abdication of King Otho as a certain consequence of the revolution, unless he should throw himself into their arms for protection. That his dethronement was actively sought and openly advocated by many of their partisans, is generally asserted, and the accusation acquires some color from the facts noticed in a pamphlet lately published at Edinburgh by Mr. Edward Masson, the British Philhellénist best acquainted with the political affairs of Greece, and who was present at Athens during the revolution. Mr. Masson says, "It cannot be denied, that an Athens correspondent of the *Morning Post*, who usually knows very accurately how the wind blows at the British legation, wrote to that journal ten days before the revolution, and stated that the object of the impending movement was positively the forcible expulsion of Otho, and the overthrow of the Bavarian dynasty; and that a constitution would not be accepted at Otho's hands, should he offer it a hundred times. This remarkable letter was printed, with observations of the editor, before the news of the revolution could reach England. *Lit-
era scripta manet.*"*

The opinion that the British and Russian legations directed

* Mr. Edward Masson resided in Greece from 1824 to 1845. He held the highest legal offices in the country, and his eloquence at the bar was the admiration of the Greeks. The pamphlet from which we quote, consists of two letters published in an Edinburgh newspaper, "The Witness;" the one addressed to Mr. Baillie Cochrane, who is also the author of a pamphlet "On the state of Greece," and the second addressed to the Earl of Dundonald, better known as Lord Cochrane. Mr. Masson is also the author of a valuable little work entitled, "*An Apology for the Greek Church; or Hints on the means of promoting the religious improvement of the Greek nation:* by Edward Masson, one of the Judges in the supreme court of Areopagus. Edited by J. S. Howson, M. A., of Trinity College, Cambridge. London. 1844." The *Morning Post* succeeded the *Morning Chronicle*, as the channel through which the Greek court was attacked at London.

the movement was so general at Athens during the affair, that on the night of the 14th of September, while the troops were marching into the square before the king's palace, the British minister was said to have sent his secretary of legation to the ministry of finance, which is opposite his residence, in order to inquire the cause of the tumult in the city. The sergeant of the guard is said to have turned round very coolly and replied, "You ask me what's the matter! Well; now that is what I call diplomacy; as if you did not know at the British mission what is going on this night in Athens a great deal better than I do."

The project of dethroning King Otho, whether entertained by the French, the English, or the Russians, (for they accused one another,) failed completely. The Greeks had begun to be disgusted with the constant interference of foreign diplomatic agents in their affairs, and neither the army nor the people could be induced to adopt the cry for an abdication. In vain the *corps diplomatique* was prevented from obtaining an audience of the king; in vain a decree compelling his majesty to confer a decoration on those who had taken up arms against him, was submitted to him for signature. King Otho had tact enough to perceive that though the people were for the constitution, they were not against him, and he was easily persuaded by the members of the council of state who communicated with him to accept all the propositions made to him, and, by keeping possession of the throne, save Greece from anarchy.

It may here be necessary to point out the other causes which prevented the success of his enemies. In such cases, foreign agents naturally pay more attention to guard against the possibility of being personally compromised in case of failure, than to arrange the details of each step in the proceedings necessary to conduct the conspiracy to success. It therefore happened that the English and Russian parties were unprepared with the precise proposals necessary to bring about their ultimate object, and while they were balancing in doubt and indecision, the people adopted the determination to make Otho a constitutional monarch. Great Britain was the first to perceive that the moment for guiding the movement had passed away, and by prudently joining the popular cause and affecting to become a partisan of King Otho's constitutional power, she acquired a predominant influence during the formation of the constitution. Russia, on the other hand, satisfied that the incongruous political position of Greece will yet require another "convention"

for its settlement, has not taken any prominent part in Greek affairs since the revolution of 1843, but has abandoned the field to the rivalry of England and France.

The constitution of Greece, completed in 1844, is not without some serious defects. It was framed by a coalition of the constitutional French and English parties, and is an imitation of European monarchical constitutions, rather than a political system, adapted to the peculiarities of Greece. In imitation of the House of Peers, a senate, consisting of members for life, has been appointed. The selection of these senators is left to the king, but his choice is restricted by numerous regulations, and the consequence is, that the Senate consists of a number of secondary characters, without influence or knowledge, and is utterly useless as a legislative chamber. Indeed, it cannot be denied, even by the warmest friends of Greece, that the national assembly, irritated by foreign domination and diplomatic intrigue, displayed a spirit of political jealousy and official cupidity, which has proved very injurious to the cause of liberty. Every Greek not born within the territory of the microscopic kingdom, or who had not taken up arms during the revolution, was excluded from all appointments under government. In consequence of this *national* decree, many of the ablest public servants were dismissed from employments they had discharged with honor for many years. Two parties were thus created among the Greeks themselves,—the *autochthones*, [citizens by birth,] and the strangers. The ingratitude of the *autochthones* in passing this disgraceful law, merits the severest reprobation; but the error of Mavrocordato and the English party, in countenancing the proceeding, was an act of pitiful weakness or blundering ambition. Their misconduct soon produced bitter fruit. From the hour the decree passed, the popularity of the English party began to decline among the enlightened portion of the nation; it was evident that the advancement of Greece was a secondary object to men who could so basely abandon liberal principles to serve their party views; and henceforth their actions were scrutinized with suspicious and searching eyes.

Immediately after the termination of the national assembly, in 1844, Mavrocordato formed a ministry under the open and avowed protection of Great Britain. With the exception of Mavrocordato himself, this ministry did not contain a single member suitable to the place he occupied. Tricoupis, who

was named minister of foreign affairs, though a man of the most honorable private character, had been unfortunately involved in political differences with Sir Edmund Lyons, which had prevented their holding any intercourse during the meeting of the national assembly; the British minister having publicly proclaimed Tricoupis as a renegade from the cause of the constitution. One consequence of the bad composition of this ministry was the immediate secession of a numerous body of constitutionalists from the English party.

The administration of Mavrocordato lasted only four months, —from the 13th of April to the 16th of August, 1844,— and in that short space of time, the English party contrived to squander away the last relics of their political reputation. The favorable state of public opinion, when Mavrocordato commenced forming his cabinet, is stated by Sir Edmund Lyons, in a despatch to the Earl of Aberdeen, in the following words: "Thus, my lord, the great political change which commenced on the 15th of September, has been consummated, almost without bloodshed, (for the gendarme who lost his life, fell by accident,) and entirely without interruption of commerce or communication by sea or land: not a vessel or a port has been stopped; the taxes have been collected and paid into the treasury, and the tribunals have pursued their ordinary course."* Such was the state of Greece in the month of April; before the month of August the country was involved in civil war,—Grivas was in arms against Mavrocordato, and the capital was on the eve of insurrection.

This change is to be attributed to the injudicious manner in which Mavrocordato and his colleagues selected their officials, and to his open subserviency to foreign influence. The ministry very soon drove both the country and the court into the opposition, and Mavrocordato himself became an object of suspicion to the people, and of aversion to the king. The imprudence of naming a man who had served in the Turkish armies as governor of Missolonghi, and of appointing "a bold but profligate captain," who had been both a rebel and a Turkish partisan, commandant of a district, admits neither of explanation nor apology.† At Athens, the general officer com-

* This document will be found in the Parliamentary Papers — *Correspondence relating to the recent events in Greece*; 1843, 1844. p. 91.

† Sir Edmund Lyons gives the favorite officer of Mavrocordato this character.—*Papers relating to the third instalment of the Greek loan*; 1835, 1836. p. 18.

manding the garrison of the capital was put forward as the ministerial candidate for the house of representatives, in direct violation of an article of the constitution just completed, and at the imminent risk of producing a bloody collision between a disorderly populace and an undisciplined soldiery. At Patras, the minister of justice endeavoured to force the inhabitants to elect him as their deputy, by means of the gendarmerie. A letter of his, ordering the officers to make use of military violence to secure his election, fell into the hands of the opposition, and was laid before the king and communicated to the press. The peal of indignation it created sounded the knell of Mavrocordato's ministry.

From the moment of its formation, this cabinet had been an object of aversion to King Otho, on account of its intimate connection with Sir Edmund Lyons. It was from a knowledge of this insuperable aversion, as well as from an opinion of its utter incapacity, that Colletti refused to take office with such colleagues. In vain M. Piscatory, the French minister, employed his influence to support Mavrocordato, and preserve the appearance of union between the French and English parties. The attempt was impracticable, and the moment Colletti perceived that the English party had shipwrecked its reputation, he stepped forward as its opponent, at the head of a large majority of the constitutionalists, supported by the court, by the strangers dismissed from office by Mavrocordato, and by the *autochthones*, or citizens by birth.

It is not our intention to review the administration of Colletti: it belongs to the domain of party politics, not to history, and the truth is still concealed in the most contradictory statements. That his ministry has been, on the whole, popular in Greece, cannot be reasonably doubted; but, in our opinion, it has carried on the government too much on the cajoling and jobbing principles of Count Armansperg, to receive from us any testimony in its favor. When the British press, however, asserts that Colletti governs Greece entirely by force and corruption, common-sense demonstrates that the thing is impossible. The whole population of Greece is armed; universal suffrage and the vote by ballot exist. Now, Colletti must be a wonderful man, if, with an army of five thousand men, he can intimidate the dispersed and disorderly population of the Greek kingdom; and if, with a net revenue of little more than ten millions of drachmas, he can bribe a majority of the population. If Colletti can really intimidate the Greeks with their

own troops, and bribe them with their own money, he is evidently the very man the protecting powers want, to save them trouble; and they ought to make much of him. The fact is, his administration has derived some popularity from the reductions made in the amount of taxation by the late house of representatives, though really without any merit on his part, for, like most ministers, he would have prevented the reduction had it been in his power.

The unusually long duration of Colletti's ministry has given a victory to French diplomacy, which has excited the bile of Lord Palmerston to such a degree, that he has commenced hostile operations against the Greek state, for submitting to a state of things so anti-Britannic. Taking advantage of the separate guarantee, given by each of the allies, for a third of the loan imposed on Greece by the treaty founding the monarchy, the British Foreign Secretary has compelled Greece to pay the interest due to Great Britain on the third guaranteed by her. In vain have France and Russia declined adopting a step of such severity, and pointed out, that if the measure should be adopted simultaneously by all the three protecting powers, it would cause the dissolution of the monarchy, and compel them to enter into new arrangements for the settlement of Greece. The English government, turning a deaf ear to these arguments, has adopted the resolution of acting independently; and Greece has already commenced paying to Great Britain the interest of a sum of money, of which the British government directed or authorized the expenditure of a larger portion than the government of Greece. The measure appears to us to be not only severe, but absolutely unjust.

We have already mentioned, that this loan was not sought for by the Greeks, but was imposed on them by the allies, for the purpose of tranquillizing the affairs of the East of Europe. The Greeks were not a contracting party to the convention of the 7th of May, 1832, (by the twelfth article of which the loan was created;) and the three protecting powers were as great gainers as Greece by the actual expenditure of the money. The Turkish question, which alarmed both France and England, was arranged with this fund. The Greeks, moreover, were left in complete ignorance of the manner in which the protecting powers had disposed of the loan, until the meeting of the national assembly, in 1843, long after it had been expended.

As Great Britain is now receiving from the Greeks her

share of the interest on this debt, let us examine in what manner she performed her share of the responsibility she assumed of disposing of the funds of the Greeks; a trust not the less sacred, surely, because it was self-arrogated, and assumed in direct violation of every financial principle of the English constitution. If we recollect rightly, the three per cents stood at about eighty-six at London, when this loan was contracted. In that case, Great Britain, by a proper use of her guarantee, might have furnished Greece with a loan at five per cent., without any loss or deduction for commission. Yet we find in the parliamentary papers, "an account of the sums accruing from the two first series of the Loan of sixty millions of francs, up to the 31st of December, 1834,"—which shows that the expenses and losses of negotiating this loan really amounted to more than four millions of francs. We transcribe the account,—it requires no comment:—

	Francs.	Cts.
"The loan being negotiated at ninety-four, occasioned a loss of six per cent., . . .	2,400,000	
Commission to Messrs. Rothschild, two per cent.,	800,000	
Commission on payment of three half years' interest and sinking fund,	36,000	
Commission to Mr. S. D'Eichthal, of Munich, for transmission of money, . .	321,690.78	
Couriers to Paris and St. Petersburg, . .	13,508.60	
Printing and stamps of certificates, . .	36,540	
Discount to Messrs. Rothschild for prompt payment of the instalments,	513,333.29	
Total of unproductive portion of the loan,	4,121,072.67	

Payments to different Powers, in execution of former treaties.

To Russia, on account of Turkey, to the amount of twenty-two millions of piastres,	5,984,235.05
To Turkey, in discharge of indemnity of forty millions of piastres,	5,236,363.63
To England, on account of £20,000 sterling, advanced upon the loan, . . .	341,333.33

	Francs.	Cts.
Total payments to the Powers,	11,561,932.01	
Total unproductive,	4,121,072.67	

Portion of the loan expended by the Three Powers,	15,683,004.68	”*
--	---------------	----

It appears, therefore, from this account laid before the British Parliament, that in realizing the two first series of the loan, or the sum of forty millions, Great Britain authorized an expenditure of 15,683,004.68, for purposes totally unconnected with the improvement of the state of Greece. We may observe, too, that it is singular to find, that while England appears to have advanced money, still a large sum is paid for discount, before the 31st of December, 1834.

We must now quit the Parliamentary Papers, in order to seek for some light concerning the commission paid to a banker at Munich, for the transmission of money. The information concerning the loan, published in Greece, enables us to trace a considerable portion of it to the coffers of Bavaria, before any part reached the Greek treasury:—

	Drachmas.
“Expense of Transporting the King, Regency, and Bavarian Officials, to Greece,	422,207.20
Transport of Bavarian Troops,	1,656,703.28
Recruiting Volunteers in Bavaria,	3,330,171
Paid to Bavaria for Military Stores,	910,607
Expenses of Bavarian Employé’s visiting Greece, on special missions,	163,545.20
Expenses of Coining the portion of the Loan remitted to Greece,	459,728.52
Salaries of the Regency,	1,409,000
Discounts paid to Bankers at Munich, Insurance, Loss on Foreign Money, &c.	928,984.36
Total received by the Bavarians,	9,280,946.56”

* *Additional Papers relating to the third instalment of the Greek loan, 1835, 1836, presented to both houses of Parliament, August, 1836; p. 2.*

These last sums are stated in drachmas,* but as we have omitted noticing a payment made out of the proceeds of the loan, to Mr. Eynard, the banker of Count Capodistrias, and some other items, we are within the mark when we say, that about twenty-five millions of francs were expended by the three powers, and by Bavaria, with the advice and consent of Great Britain, before a single dollar of the loan reached the hands of the Greeks. Besides this, the accounts of the Greek revenue since the establishment of the monarchy prove that the expenses entailed on Greece by the Bavarian troops, volunteers, and civil officials, by the civil list of the king, and by the diplomatic missions which the royal dignity was supposed to require at Paris, London, St. Petersburg, Munich, Madrid, and Constantinople, considerably exceed the sum of fifteen millions of francs. So that Greece, far from receiving any pecuniary advantage from the loan, has been a very serious sufferer. Indeed, it appears that Greece has only received about ten millions of the loan of sixty millions, in order to cover the deficit which has occurred in the budget since the year 1832, and that the remaining fifty millions have been expended, either in the manner we have stated above, or in payment of the interest and sinking fund of the loan, as it became due. In the month of June, 1836, Russia proposed "that the funds accruing from the third instalment of the loan should be appropriated exclusively to the payment of the interest and sinking fund of the loan during the next five or six years." This strange proposition to retain Greece in perpetual thralldom, by increasing her debt unnecessarily, was not adopted by the other powers; but Greece has not been a great gainer by the modifications they introduced.

The revenues of Greece average about thirteen millions of drachmas. Of this sum, about two millions are absorbed by the expense of collection, for a worse financial system than that of the Greek monarchy cannot be found,—one million is wasted on the exorbitant civil list of King Otho; so that only ten millions remain to defray the current expenditure of a government which has an army of five thousand men, and a fleet manned by two thousand sailors. Capodistrias governed Greece with a revenue of about four millions, and the increased expenses of the monarchy were imposed on the country by the

* There is a difference of more than ten per cent. between the franc and the drachma;—six drachmas are equal to our dollar.

three powers, and fostered and encouraged by Great Britain, during the lavish expenditure of the English party, in 1835 and 1836. It is, therefore, an act of political iniquity as well as open hostility, for Great Britain to hold Greece responsible for the whole of the loan of sixty millions. No court, either of law or equity, would condemn a private individual standing in the position of Greece towards the protecting powers, to repay more than the sum which these guardians can prove was actually employed for the maintenance of their ward. Now Greece can show, that if those having the power had paid due attention to the Greek finances, ten millions of francs, or even drachmas, would have covered the deficits in the Greek budgets up to the end of 1836, when the allies commenced the issue of the third series of the loan, to pay themselves the interest and sinking fund of two former series spent under their authority.

It is really lamentable to behold France, Great Britain, and Russia, the three great powers of Europe, which so rarely combine to confer any benefit on the human race, uniting in the closest alliance to keep the Greek population in perpetual thralldom by a financial juggle. They reduce the king they have appointed to a worthless pageant, the government to a trembling deputy, and they destroy the future hopes of the nation. That they have all soiled their fingers with the ink of the Greek accounts, is undeniable ; but it was reserved for the unquiet spirit and restless hands of Lord Palmerston to daub with this ink the blushing cheeks of Britannia.

The question here suggests itself, why do the great powers exert themselves so determinedly to retain the Greek nation in a state of subserviency ? The explanation must be sought in the unsettled state of the East and the critical position of the Ottoman empire. The Sultan still rules over more than three millions of Greek subjects, and each of the allies entertains some hope of making the condition of the Greek population useful to advance its own projects of ambition, should any sudden event cause a revolution in the Ottoman empire. The anti-Greek policy of Great Britain during the administration of Colletti, whether at Athens, Corfu, or Constantinople, has, however, seriously injured the popularity of that power among the whole Greek nation. At a moment when the consolidation of internal order and the advancement of social improvement was the prayer of every Greek, British diplomacy stepped forward to produce financial confusion, in order to drive Collet-

ti from office, at the risk of involving Greece in civil war and anarchy.

In the meantime, Russia, who can hardly be supposed to view the establishment of a free people in the Levant with much favor, has sufficient prudence to leave to England the unpopular task of arresting the progress of Greece. Russia knows well that the feeble and trimming policy of the French government will effectually prevent France from affording Greece the aid necessary to develop her moral resources in such a manner as to open a new destiny to the Greek race; and she already perceives that the hostility of Great Britain will in all probability soon involve Greece in such a state of anarchy as must drive both the people and the king to throw themselves at the feet of Russia, and refer the settlement of their affairs to her arbitration.

We have very little to say concerning the conduct of France. Her policy seems to be confined to keeping Colletti in office and obtaining from the king as many crosses and stars for Frenchmen as his majesty can be induced to part with. For the internal improvement of Greece, France has not done more than her colleagues. No measures have been recommended to check the corruption of the general government, nor to prevent the pillage of the large revenues of the Greek municipalities. Oligarchy is supported in the communes, and all the absurdity of a double election of mayors and aldermen; while universal suffrage exists as regards the legislature. No internal improvements are made; and from what we have seen of Athens, the capital of Greece, we are inclined to think, that, with one of the largest palaces in Europe, it has the filthiest streets and worst police that ever disgraced an overgrown village. Yet Athens has large local revenues, and four deputies in the house of representatives.

The Greek nation, when separated entirely from its rulers, offers to our contemplation a more cheering scene. The revolution owed its success to the mass of the population; their enthusiasm and endurance secured the liberty of Greece. The army and navy were utterly inadequate to encounter the forces of the Sultan in a protracted war, and the government had neither the talents nor the resources required to contend with the Pasha of Egypt; the people alone, by their persevering spirit of resistance, rejected the idea of defeat, and clung to their independence. Nor has the popular energy relaxed since the establishment of the monarchy, though it has now taken a

more peaceful direction. Whatever progress Greece has made in political and social civilization under the government of King Otho, must be attributed to the efforts of the people, striving on the one hand to push forward their listless rulers, and on the other to elude the efforts of the European powers to retard their advance. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, if we find the progress of Greece in the career of improvement to be rather eccentric. While towns are rebuilt; while commerce and trade are advancing; while the press is free, and the number of publications daily increasing; while one class, in short, is occupied with trade, commerce, art, and literature, another remains scattered over the greater part of the kingdom, pursuing the labors of agriculture in poverty and ignorance. While the towns of Athens, Syra, Nauplia, and Patras equal any towns of their size in Europe, in social culture, the rural population in their immediate vicinity continues in the most primitive condition. This superiority in the social position of the inhabitants of the towns must be attributed to the influence which public opinion acquires wherever free institutions exist with any density of population, and to the freedom with which knowledge is allowed to circulate. In Greece, not only is the press perfectly free, but even the importation of books, whether in the Greek or any other language, is not subjected to the smallest duty. Education in the towns is therefore more common than either in the south of France, in Spain, Italy, Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, or Malta; and books of sterling value are much more common. The booksellers' shops of Athens may be compared with those of Malta, Corfu, and Gibraltar, with great advantage to the Greeks.* Wherever the population is sufficiently compressed to enable it to enjoy the advantages of a rapid communication of ideas, there knowledge has produced unity of action. In the country, on the other hand, the extreme thinness of the agricultural population, and the great physical difficulties in the way of frequent intercommunication, have left the inhabitants of extensive districts in

* Some information on the state of education in Greece, previous to the revolution in 1843, will be found in an article by Monsieur Ampère, of the Académie Française, which appeared in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1^{er} Avril, 1843: "*De l'instruction publique et du mouvement intellectuel en Grèce.*" At present there are two French and sixteen Greek newspapers published in the kingdom. Since 1843, about sixty-three octavo volumes have been printed at Athens alone, on scientific, historical, moral, and religious subjects, besides a much greater number of political pamphlets. There are also presses at Syra, Nauplia, and Patras.

Greece deprived of all the advantages of moral and political culture, as well as of elementary education. To place the independence of Greece on a solid basis, the first step must be to improve the condition of the agricultural classes.

To do this effectually, the assistance of the government is indispensable. The legislature must commence by prohibiting the farming of the tithes, and by repealing all the revenue laws which render the government, in virtue of its claim for one tenth as a tax, the virtual masters of the whole crop. If agriculture is ever to improve in Greece, it cannot be until the cultivator obtains the absolute disposal of all his agricultural arrangements. What can farmers do in the way of improvement, who are compelled to ask permission to commence the harvest and to house the crop? It is true, that Mr. Colletti made an attempt lately to put an end to the system of farming the tithes. The English party, however, succeeded in throwing out his bill, in the expectation of compelling him to resign. Colletti, however, aware of the popularity of his measure, ventured to dissolve the chamber, though the budget had not been passed; and so well had he estimated the popular indignation at the conduct of the opposition, that not one of the members who had sacrificed the advantage of their country to party and diplomatic intrigue succeeded in being reelected.

Our space will not allow us to enter into any statistical details concerning Greece, for such details must be extremely minute in order to reveal the strange varieties of civilization and the strong social contrasts that exist in the different classes of the population.* As there can be no doubt, however, that the future fate of the Greeks as a nation will depend more on their own personal exertions and individual qualities than on the combinations of the feeble monarchy now existing,—it is of some importance to notice the actual state of education. The general field of religious and moral culture demands a far more extensive and searching investigation than we can bestow. We shall therefore confine our observations to the University of Athens, which has become the living fountain of knowledge to the whole Greek race.

* For statistical information we must refer to "*Greece as a kingdom, or a statistical description of that country, drawn up from official documents and other authentic sources*," by Frederic Strong, Esq., consul at Athens, for their majesties the kings of Bavaria and Hanover. London. 1842. 8vo. This work is unfortunately very imperfect, but the chapters on religion and education may be consulted with profit.

Mr. Maurer was engaged in preparing the charter of the University when he was recalled. Count Armansperg, in his terror of every thing which was really liberal, proposed abandoning the project entertained by Mr. Maurer, and wished to establish four separate schools, namely: of Theology, Law, Medicine, and Philosophy. The difficulty he met with in this illiberal project caused him to delay the establishment of the university until he was aware that his recall had been decided on. He then prepared in haste a confused and imperfect organization for the university, at the commencement of January, 1837. By the exertions of Mr. Brandis, the accomplished professor at Bonn, this organization underwent considerable improvement, and the university was at last established, on the 15th of May, 1837.*

Though the government had been compelled to yield to public opinion so far as to found the university, it still met with many obstacles in its progress. Ample funds had been appropriated for establishing orders of knighthood and other useless concomitants of royal pageantry; an immense palace had been erected to lodge King Otho, but not one cent could be found to construct a building to enable the professors to lecture, or to render the national library available to the public. The teachers were often silent for want of lecture rooms; for Athens then hardly possessed houses sufficient for its inhabitants. The books sent as donations to Greece for the use of the studios, were left to rot, piled volume upon volume, in damp and dilapidated churches. The people now came forward to perform the duties neglected by their rulers; party feelings were laid aside, and in spite of court and diplomatic intrigues and personal antipathies, a public meeting was held at Athens. The Capodistrian party was allowed to take the lead, and it was resolved to raise the sum necessary for erecting an university and public library by private subscriptions. The contributions of the Greeks over all Europe were most liberal. Large sums were sent from London, Vienna, and Hungary, and in a very short time the subscriptions amounted to forty thousand dollars. A handsome building has now been erected. The number of the professors, ordinary and extraordinary, amounts at present to thirty-four, all of whom deliver lectures, though many of them receive only very trifling salaries, from the cir-

* See a pamphlet published at Athens, entitled, *Περὶ Πανεπιστημίων ἐν γένει καὶ ἰδιαιτέρως περὶ τοῦ Ὀθωνείου Πανεπιστημίου, ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1845*, — p. 26.

cumstance of their holding government appointments connected with the subjects on which they deliver their instructions. The professorships are distributed as follows: Theology, three; Law, nine; Medicine, ten; Philosophy, twelve. The number of students amounts to nearly three hundred, and of these about one hundred and fifty are Greeks from the Turkish dominions and the transdanubian principalities, who repair to Athens to complete their studies. This fact alone is sufficient to prove the immense influence this institution cannot fail to exercise over the ultimate fate of the Ottoman empire.

It must be observed, that besides the Theological faculty at the university, there is a college for priests, founded by a legacy of two brothers named Rizaris. This college has five teachers, (of whom only one is a professor at the university,) and about twenty-five students. The library of the university consists of nearly forty thousand volumes, but its value does not correspond with its extent. As it has been composed almost entirely of donations, every department is extremely imperfect. The kings of Naples and Prussia, and the French government, have been the most liberal foreign benefactors, and they have contributed many valuable works. A very valuable collection of the earliest Greek books, in which we believe every *editio princeps* of the Greek classics will be found, and every edition containing the best text, was purchased by the Greek government from Mr. Postolaka, a Greek who had spent many years at Vienna in forming this inestimable portion of a public library at Athens. The library contains also a few Sanscrit manuscripts and Greek translations from the Sanscrit, left to the university by an Athenian named Galanos, who died in India, where he resided many years and devoted much time to the study of Sanscrit literature. Some of his translations have been lately printed at Athens, edited by Messrs. Typaldos and Apostolides, the librarians of the university.*

* It may be interesting to our readers to see a list of the subjects on which the professors of the Athenian university lecture. Of course they vary a little in the different semesters.

THEOLOGY.—Dogmatic Theology. Ecclesiastical History. Hebrew and Sacred History.

LAW.—Roman Law. Common Law of Greece. French Civil Code. Commercial Jurisprudence. Law of Nations. History of Roman Law. Philosophy of Judicial Institutions.

MEDICINE.—Pathology and Therapeutics. Anatomy. Surgery. Midwifery. Nosology. Ophthalmology. Practice of Medicine. Forensic Medicine. Pharmacy. Physiology.

PHILOSOPHY.—Greek Philology. Latin Philology. Archæology. His-

The future prospects of the Greek nation cannot certainly be considered as destitute of hope, when the people display so much energy, and direct that energy with so much judgment. Still we must not be too sanguine in our expectations. As long as the agricultural classes remain in a stationary condition as to intelligence, wealth, and numbers, the national civilization rests on an uncertain and adventitious basis. The civilization of Greece rests on the democratic power existing in the state; this power excites great jealousy in all the European governments connected with the Levant, and its development is not regulated by an enlightened internal administration. The task of introducing moral discipline into Greek society, and of raising the rude peasantry to the position of orderly and intelligent landed proprietors, is one of no ordinary difficulty. To do this, in the face of an active enemy like Great Britain, and with a feeble ally like France, demands a larger fund of patriotism than is possessed either by Mavrocordato or Colletti. Indeed, unless Greece can be released from the thralldom of the three powers, she can only hope for a permanent improvement of her political condition by some great convulsion in the East.

We own, however, that we are not entirely without hopes that the protecting powers will be induced, by the strength of public opinion in the enlightened portion of European society, to commence repairing some of the injuries they have committed since 1832. France and Russia have almost come to the conclusion, that the loan of sixty millions ought to be regarded as a bad debt; and even Great Britain, in exacting payment of her share, had the frankness to declare, that the British government took the severe step of compelling the Greeks to pay annually the sum of £46,000, as interest and sinking fund of a loan they had not been allowed to spend, "to prevent the administration of Mr. Colletti from carrying on a system of speculation and corruption."* Yet it is impossible not to observe, that if any circumstance should induce France and Russia to adopt the policy of England, then the darling object of the anonymous correspondent of the *Morning*

tory. Statistics. Natural History. Metaphysics. Physics. Experimental Philosophy. Mathematics. Chemistry. Botany. Political Economy.

* See an excellent speech of Lord Palmerston, on Greek affairs, in the British Parliament, on the 3rd of May, 1847. It is to be regretted that the conduct of the British government at Athens does not correspond with its language at London.

Chronicle and the Morning Post would be attained, and King Otho would be driven from the throne of Greece. At all events, the Greek kingdom has little chance of enjoying internal tranquillity as long as any one of the three powers can disturb the government and derange the finances of the country, according to party views. The conduct of Great Britain, coming in aid of the errors of Mr. Colletti, has produced no less than three dangerous insurrections, and a considerable loss of life and property in the present year [1847].

If the three powers, or even Great Britain alone, would determine to enforce payment of the interest of the loan, for the purpose of preventing the speculation and corruption of the Greek government, no matter whether Colletti, Mavrocordato, or Metaxas should be prime minister,—and if they would apply the sums extorted from the government, in improving the condition of the people, and in doing those things essential to the independent existence of the nation which have been neglected by the regency, by the king, and by the English, French, and Russian parties, while in power; then, indeed, the three powers might lay claim to be really benefactors to Greece. Let this sum be employed in forming roads, building bridges, establishing steamers and ferry-boats, repairing ports, and facilitating communications; for, strange to say, the only roads at present existing in Greece, are those round the capital, which lead to nothing, and serve principally as drives for the carriages of the court, and of the members of the *corps diplomatique*; and the only steamers are royal yachts, kept to transport foreign princes who happen to visit Greece, from one port to another.

The three powers are certainly the parties most to blame for the actual state of Greece. Who on earth, though bred in the corrupted regions of a court, except Talleyrand, Palmerston, and Lieven, could, in the nineteenth century, have entertained the project of founding a monarchy, before creating the means of enabling the central government to act with celerity, or enabling the people to feel the necessity of national unity? The Greek monarchy, from its geographical configuration, presents singular difficulties to internal communication, and as these difficulties caused the division of the country into a number of independent states, in ancient times, it cannot have been overlooked by such profound classical scholars as the English ministers. The monarchy they established is, moreover, divided into four distinct divisions on the map,—con-

tinental Greece, the Peloponnesus, Eubœa, and the islands of the Archipelago. The continental portion is pierced by gulfs, and intersected by bare and rugged limestone mountains, twelve separate chains of which rise to an elevation of upwards of six thousand feet above the valleys at their base. There are thirty inhabited islands. A journey by land, from one end of the kingdom to another, occupies more time than one from the Penobscot to Pensacola; and a voyage from Scopelo to Santarin generally consumes more time than one from Boston to New Orleans. It cannot be wondered at, therefore, if there exists a constant striving on the part of the population of Greece to destroy the work of the three powers, and break up the monarchy into a number of independent states. The control of the central government is only manifested in compelling the people of the provinces to remit their taxes to Athens; the internal trade is so insignificant, that each village thinks it would be a gainer by refusing to pay its quota of taxation, and by assuming complete independence. The operation of this feeling is not without effect in producing the constant insurrections which disturb the government of Greece.

In order to perpetuate the existence of the monarchy, it is necessary for the three powers to make a new protocol on the affairs of Greece. They must compel King Otho to reduce his civil list to one quarter of its present amount; they must prevent their own ministers from defrauding the Greek custom-house, and sacrificing the honor of European chivalry, by availing themselves of their diplomatic privilege; they must prohibit their consuls from carrying on the trade of usurers. In place of calumniating the Greek court in European newspapers, and exciting the Greek people to rebellion, they must indicate to the government the steps necessary to reform the municipalities and guarantee the impartial administration of justice. If some such line of conduct be not speedily adopted, we fear that the state of Greece will very soon begin to trouble the repose of Europe.

The Turks tell a story not quite inapplicable to present circumstances. They say that a restless English voluptuary once visited the East, whose name may be translated, Lord Cupid Fractious. He purchased a beautiful Circassian slave, named Fatmah, and presented her with a pair of brilliant slippers, richly embroidered with diamonds. The lady walked up and down the room in raptures, surveying both the slippers

and her own pretty feet. Lord Cupid sate on his divan looking at the beauty, but admiring his own present. Fatmah was at last tired, and wished to sit down, but her master exclaimed, "Another turn, Fatmah! another turn!" For a while, female vanity sustained poor Fatmah, who believed Cupid was moved by admiration of her beauty; but Cupid's constant exclamation of "another turn, Fatmah; how beautiful the slippers are!" revealed the sad truth, that his lordship was thinking of nothing but his own magnanimity. The indignant Fatmah could bear the fatigue no longer; so taking off the diamond slippers, she threw them in the face of Lord Cupid Fractionous, with such vigor, that he could see neither lady nor slippers for the next fortnight, and exclaimed, as she rushed weeping out of the room: "Keep your gifts, I neither want your generosity nor your tyranny!"

Great Britain ought to meditate on the conduct of her ministers to Greece, and pause for a moment, ere she takes upon herself the responsibility of their acts. Let her not put implicit faith in their talk about the liberty of the Greeks, when she hears that they are accused by foreigners of rank and honor of acting the part of incendiaries at Athens, and of oppressors at Corfu. The conduct of the British government towards Greece has now fixed the attention of the civilized world, and will be recorded in the page of history, whatever may be the regret felt by the friends of England in registering the truth.

The claims of Greece to enter the commonwealth of independent states are undeniable, and depend no longer on the enthusiasm of scholars, or the dreams of poets. Homer, Sophocles, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Plato, Aristotle, Basil, and Chrysostom, are, indeed, names which in future ages will be revered, in regions now unpeopled; but such names, as they cast no spell over the minds of trading politicians, do not constitute any claim to national independence. Yet, even European statesmen admit that the constancy of the *palikari* in war, and the activity of the citizen in peace; that the existence of a free press; of the trial by jury; of municipal institutions; of a representative chamber, and of a national system of education, give Greece the fullest right to complete political independence. Though the state of the country be disturbed, the morality of the public men lax, and though both life and property demand additional security, still let the impartial student of political history compare the moral, political, and intellectual condition of Athens under the administra-

tion of Mr. Colletti, with that of Corfu under the more absolute government of the British peer, Lord Seaton, and the comparison will almost persuade him that Greece is an enlightened monarchy and Colletti a great minister. That our opinion is not quite so favorable, the readers of this paper must be fully convinced. We have endeavoured in the preceding pages to give an accurate and impartial sketch of the present miserable position of the Greek kingdom. Greece now stands on the threshold of the assembly of nations. Great Britain threatens to close the gates of that assembly against her,—perhaps for ever. The deed, if accomplished, would go down to the latest posterity as a crime of the blackest dye. Against the perpetration of this crime we attempt to raise a warning voice, moved by feelings of affection and veneration for both parties. If our judgment on the facts we have recorded be correct, (and we can answer that our industry in the search after truth has been persevering,) it seems to us not impossible that even this incomplete statement of a nation's wrongs may awaken some sympathy across the Atlantic, and render Greece some service at the very crisis of her fate.

ART. IV.—THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF AGASSIZ.

THE best news for American scholars, lately, is the definitive acceptance by Mr. Agassiz of the Professorship of Zoölogy and Geology, at Cambridge. This must give additional interest to any particulars concerning his life and labors hitherto, and we have accordingly applied ourselves, with what books and documents were at hand, and, above all, with the assistance of friends specially informed on the subject, to compile a sketch of his private history and scientific career.

The Agassiz family is of French origin, and were among those Protestants whom the revocation of the edict of Nantes obliged to leave France.

The immediate ancestors of Mr. Agassiz fled to the Pays de Vaud, which at that time made part of the Canton of Bern. From the time of their establishment in their new residence, their prosperity has been uninterrupted. The branch to which our naturalist belongs has been especially devoted to the min-

istry; the whole line for five generations having been clergymen. The father of Agassiz was pastor at St. Imier (one of the protestant parishes of the ancient bishopric of Basle, which had been just incorporated into the French empire,) when he married the younger daughter of a physician of the Canton de Vaud, Mademoiselle Rose Mayor, a young lady as remarkable for the vivacity of her mind as for her beauty. They had the misfortune to see their first four children die one after the other, and the family seemed in danger of becoming extinct, when there was born a fifth son, who has become the eminent man of whose life and labors we propose to give some account.

LOUIS AGASSIZ was born on the 28th of May, 1807; exactly a century after the birth of Linnæus. From his birth he was the object of an unbounded tenderness, and surrounded by all the care which the most watchful solicitude could suggest to parents alarmed by the loss of four children. Fearing the influence of the severe climate of St. Imier, the pastor Agassiz had just left this parish to take charge of one in a village in the canton of Friburg, called Mottier, situated on the peninsula of Vully, between the Lake of Neufchatel and the Lake of Morat. It was here that Agassiz was born. Here, on the borders of the beautiful lake, at the foot of a hill covered with rich vineyards, in full view of the chain of the Alps, he passed his first years, under the vigilant eye of a mother who divined from the first the future that was enfolded in the young and ardent nature of her child.

After having received his first education in his father's house, Agassiz was placed with his younger brother at the gymnasium of Bienne, a small town in the neighbourhood. This establishment was at that time very celebrated throughout the canton. The two brothers passed here several years, devoted almost exclusively to the study of the ancient languages. Their father in the meantime had left the parish of Mottier, and accepted a situation in his own canton, in the little town of Orbe, situated at the foot of the Jura. It was during the vacations which he passed with his parents, that the attention of the young student was turned for the first time toward the Natural Sciences. Those who knew him at that time remember the ardor with which he made his first collections, and the delight he showed when on his return from an excursion he had some new butterfly, or some curious insect, to show to his mother. This taste for Natural History re-

ceived new nourishment, when, in consequence of a second promotion, his father was called to the parish of Concise, a large village situated on the Lake of Neufchatel. The vicinity of the lake, which washes the garden-walls of the parsonage, opened a new field to his insatiable curiosity concerning natural objects. From this moment his attention was especially directed to the Fishes; and as if he had already a presentiment of the great results which he was one day to deduce from the philosophical study of these animals, he not only applied himself to collecting them, but also began to inquire into their habits, their manner of life, and the characters by which they are distinguished. He took part in all fishing-excursions, accompanied the fishermen on all occasions, and often went alone, with his line in hand, to pass whole days in the middle of the lake. When he came afterwards to compare the results which he had obtained with the accounts given in treatises on Natural History, he saw immediately how much remained to be done in this department; and the idea of filling this gap constantly occupied his mind.

He had now finished his studies at school. It was to be expected that, following the example of his ancestors, he would devote himself to the priesthood. But Natural History had gained too much ascendancy. His father wisely left to him the choice of a profession. He chose that of Medicine, as offering the most opportunities for pursuing his beloved studies. He commenced the study of Medicine at the Academy of Zurich, where he was most kindly received by Professor Schinz, who admitted him to an intimate acquaintance, and furnished every facility in his power for the pursuit of his zoölogical researches. From Zurich he went to the University of Heidelberg, where he devoted himself especially to the study of Anatomy, under the direction of the celebrated professor, Tiedemann. His assiduity in study did not prevent him from taking part in all the amusements of the student-life, so that the Swiss *corps* chose him for their president, and long after he had quitted the university he was still spoken of as an accomplished *Bursch*, possessing the rare talent of managing with equal dexterity the rapier and the scalpel.

It was at this time that the Bavarian government, having recently organized the University of Munich, called thither as professors the most eminent men of Germany in all the departments of science. There were brought together at that time, Oken, the celebrated zoölogist; Martius, the botanist, who

had lately returned from his travels in South America, with a rich harvest of scientific materials; Schelling, the great philosopher; and Döllinger, the founder of modern Physiology. Such a corps of teachers could not fail to attract a large body of youth eager to learn. Among others, Agassiz did not hesitate to quit the fashionable University of Heidelberg for the rude capital of Bavaria.

It is here that his scientific career commences. The four years that he passed at the new university may be counted among the most remarkable of his life. Although only a student, his already extensive knowledge of Natural History soon drew the attention of the professors, whose lectures he eagerly attended. Friendships sprung up between him and them, and the intimacy in which he lived with these chosen men resulted in an increased enthusiasm for science, as well as an extension of the field of his researches.

With Martius he studied the organization of plants, and their geographical distribution according to climates and regions of the globe. With Döllinger (in whose house he lived,) he penetrated into the sublime mysteries of the formation of animals, and their development during the embryonic period. With Oken he discussed the principles of Classification according to the intimate affinities of things, based on a profound study of their organization.

Finally, with Schelling he approached those questions of the higher philosophy, which in Germany more than anywhere else have at all times been the study of the greatest minds; namely, the relations that exist between the immaterial essence of beings, and the laws of the physical world—in other words, between Spirit and Matter. The pantheistic theory was embraced at that time by many enlightened men in Germany; and it is not surprising, that, supported by the results of modern science, and professed under a new and attractive form by an eminent man, who, freed from all party considerations, presented it in all its grandeur—it excited the enthusiasm of the young men who crowded round the chair of this celebrated philosopher, already prepared for the doctrine by the writings of Goethe and Schiller. Agassiz, if we are rightly informed, partook also of their opinions. It was not until afterwards, that, (as we shall show directly,) having commenced the study of former creations, he modified his views, and unhesitatingly proclaimed as the result of his investigations, the existence of a personal God, the Author and Ruler of the universe.

Agassiz, as we have already said, though only a student, ranked at this time among the scientific men of Munich. A few young men of like spirit gathered round him, forming a small but select circle who met to discuss scientific subjects. This society soon attracted attention; it was called *the little Academy*; even the professors gladly took part in it; and those of the students who had the good fortune to be members of it remember the lectures read there, as not the least instructive and interesting part of their scientific course.

Martius was then occupied in publishing his great work on the Natural History of Brazil. He confined himself to the part relating to Botany. His companion, Spix, who was to edit the zoölogical portion, had just died, leaving many portions of his work unfinished. That relating to Ichthyology, in particular, was barely sketched out. An able zoölogist was needed to reduce to order the chaos of new species and genera, and to assign to them their true places in the system. Martius cast his eyes upon his young friend Agassiz, to whom he confided the honorable task of elaborating this important part of the work. It appeared in a folio volume in Latin, with numerous plates; making part of the "Travels in Brazil." From the time of its appearance it gained for its author the rank of an eminent naturalist.

Such occupations necessarily resulted in detaching the young naturalist more and more from his medical studies. His parents, who had already often protested against this too exclusive passion of their son for Natural History, now had recourse to an extreme measure; they withdrew the moderate allowance which they had hitherto granted him. This was a terrible blow for the young man, who found himself thus at once deprived of all means of subsistence, and obliged to renounce what was dearer than all to him, his portfolios; for his allowance had not only supplied his daily wants, but had also been applied to paying for the services of a young artist named Dinkel, whom he had remarked among the crowd of draughtsmen who fill the streets of Munich, and who under his guidance became one of the most skilful painters in this department.

But, like other passions, the love of science is ingenious in surmounting difficulties. Full of confidence in himself, he applied to the bookseller Cotta, a man who united with great skill in business the most enlarged views. To him he showed the materials he had collected for a Natural History of the Fresh-

water Fishes of Europe. The beauty of the drawings, the finish of the details, and above all the enthusiasm of the young man, gained the heart of the old bookseller, who advanced him funds to continue and complete his work.

At the same time Agassiz, like a good son, sought to regain the favor of his parents. For this there was but one thing to be done; namely, to return to Medicine. Until now he had divided his time between his medical and his zoölogical studies; but now, we may infer that he applied himself seriously to his profession, since not long after he presented himself as candidate for the degree of Doctor, and passed his examination with distinction. But the title of Doctor of Medicine was not enough for him. In the same year he applied for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, which he received after a public disputation which produced a great sensation in the literary community of Munich.

He undertook to show that woman is superior to man. *Mens femine viri animo superior*, was the theme of his disputation. Such a proposition, coming from a young man whose devotion to the fair sex was well known, could not fail to attract attention. It was received with the most various sentiments. The young applauded the irresistible arguments of the youthful candidate; puritanic conservatives, and those belonging to what is called in Germany the *Historical School*, thundered against these ideas, as revolutionary and calculated to subvert the order of society. The sphere of woman, they thought, should not be extended beyond the kitchen and the laundry.

After this double examination, Agassiz received permission from his parents to visit Vienna. The object of this journey was the completion of his medical studies; but on his arrival he devoted himself again to his favorite pursuit, and was oftener to be met with at the Museum than in the hospital. Here he made the acquaintance of many distinguished naturalists, among others of Fitzinger; and applied himself to the special study of Ichthyology.

This study, with him, was not confined to living species. He had extended his researches to the fossil kinds, and the *débris* (often admirably preserved,) found in the fresh-water deposits of Oeningen, in Switzerland, had attracted his particular attention. He found that most of the species said to be identical with those of the present epoch, were different, and therefore had drawings made of a great number; so that when

he returned to Switzerland his portfolio contained almost as many fossil as recent species. What was he to do with all these materials? His parents having already made great sacrifices for him, and seeing no guarantee for the future, were impatient for him to begin his medical career. In this conflict of his tastes and his filial duties, his position was difficult.

But he had not yet seen Paris, and he could not make up his mind to commence practice without having examined the rich collections of that great capital; without having visited the Jardin des Plantes; and above all, without having heard Cuvier, whose renown filled the world.

But how was he to find means to go to Paris? His parents were neither able nor willing to contribute any thing towards it. Fortunately a neighbouring clergyman, a friend of his father, who had always entertained the highest opinion of his talents, having just inherited a small sum of money, thought he could not employ it better than in aiding the project of his young friend.

On his arrival in Paris, Agassiz lost no time in seeking out the two most eminent men of the age, then residing in that city—Cuvier and Humboldt.

Cuvier, in order to assuage his grief for the death of his daughter, had just commenced his great work on Fishes, and received with eagerness every thing concerning fossil species. Agassiz relied upon his portfolio for his introduction to the great naturalist. Cuvier was so much astonished by it, that after a second interview he informed Agassiz that he would give up the projected publication and make over to him all his materials, if he would undertake to describe them. For those who know the value which the materials for a literary work acquire in the eyes of an author, this incident by itself will be sufficient proof that Cuvier's moral character was equal to his intellectual power. From this moment Agassiz continued on intimate terms with Cuvier's family, until the death of that great man, and we have heard him say that the happiest moments of his life were passed in Cuvier's cabinet.

After the death of Cuvier (1832), Agassiz returned to Switzerland, hoping to obtain a professorship in some of the public establishments of the Canton de Vaud. Being disappointed in this, he accepted the invitation of some citizens of Neuchâtel to establish himself in that city, where they were preparing to reorganize the college. He was soon after appointed Professor of Natural History, a place which he filled until his departure for the United States.

Alexander von Humboldt, — who has enjoyed the rare privilege of being able to assist so many men of talent, — was from the first the devoted friend of Agassiz, and it was his patronage that enabled our naturalist to commence in 1833, so soon after his arrival in Switzerland, the publication of his great work on Fossil Fishes; which he dedicated to Humboldt, and of which we intend to say a few words, as of all his works this made the greatest sensation, and it is this that obtained for him the eminent rank which he now holds in the scientific world.

This work consists of five volumes, with an atlas of about four hundred folio plates, and comprises descriptions and figures of nearly a thousand species of fossil fishes. All the specimens are represented of the natural size, with the colors of the bed from which they were taken. It was impossible that so many new species should be made known without rendering many alterations necessary in the science of Ichthyology; new types were established, and the affinities of various groups and families to each other more clearly shown. Moreover, Agassiz did not confine himself to establishing a vast number of species, genera, and even families. Beside this he founded an entirely new classification, based principally on the importance of the fossil fishes.

Cuvier makes two general divisions among Fishes; the Osseous and the Cartilaginous fishes. Agassiz also separates the Osseous fishes from the Cartilaginous, of which he makes his first order, that of the Placoidians; but he divides the Osseous fishes again into three other equally important orders; so that the class of Fishes is divided into four orders; namely, 1. The Placoidians; 2. The Ganoidians; 3. The Ctenoidians; and 4. The Cycloidians. This classification is not founded on the skeleton, like that of Cuvier, but on the nature of the outward integuments, the scales. Agassiz starts with the principle that the outward covering of fishes is the reflex of their internal organization. With this principle he examines the different families of the class of Fishes, with respect to their scales, and finds in the conformation of the external integument a variety of characters, on which he founds his classification. As to this, it is to be remarked at the outset, that all the Osseous fishes, with the exception of a few genera, are furnished with horny scales; while the skin of the Cartilaginous fishes is covered with plates or spines, of a peculiar form, known under the names of *shagreen*, &c. The scales of the

Osseous fishes are constructed on a totally different plan, and the differences are so marked, that Mr. Agassiz considered them a sufficient foundation for his three orders of Cycloïdians, Ctenoïdians and Ganoïdians. The two former, which comprise almost all the Osseous fishes of the present epoch, both have horny scales; but they differ in this, that the Ctenoïdians have the posterior edge of the scales indented, while in the Cycloïdians this border is entire. He seeks to prove that this distinction, apparently insignificant, is, in truth, founded in nature, being the expression of a fundamental character which reveals itself equally in other parts of the body. Thus, fishes having indented or pectinated scales, have generally prickles on the head, the opercula, and various parts of their body; while the others—the Cycloïdians—are smooth, and without defence. Mr. Agassiz considers the Perch, with the analogous species, as the type of his order of Ctenoïdians; and the family of the Carp, Salmon, Pike, &c., as typical of the Cycloïdians. This division corresponds, therefore, to a certain extent, with Cuvier's division of fishes into Acanthopterygians and Malacopterygians.

The second order, that of the Ganoïdians, seems to have a yet more satisfactory foundation. There have been found in the Nile and in the rivers of North America, two fishes which have always puzzled the ichthyologists; that of the Nile is known under the name of *Bichir* (*Polypterus Bichir*); the other, which is found in America, is called the Gar-pike (*Lepidosteus*), having some resemblance to the Pike. Both these fishes are furnished with scales of very peculiar form and structure. Instead of being arranged in the manner of roof-tiles,—as in most fishes,—they are placed simply side by side, the surface being covered with a coat of enamel, making a very solid cuirass. On examining these fishes in an anatomical point of view, Mr. Agassiz found that the skeleton presented no less striking differences than the scales and the soft parts of the body. Nevertheless, it seemed hazardous to separate them altogether from the other great families; and particularly when the smallness of their number was considered, it seemed contrary to all method to place them in the same rank with the Placoidians on one side, and the Osseous fishes on the other. But the procedure, though not authorized by the study of the living fishes, was justified by an examination of fossil species. Here is displayed a whole ichthyological fauna, having the characters neither of the Osseous

nor of the Cartilaginous fishes, but altogether analogous to the Bichir and the *Lepidosteus*. So that these two genera, apparently mere exceptions in the present creation, in reality constitute a type by themselves, which, though not numerous at present, is, nevertheless, the expression of an entire order of things. Associating with these fishes the numerous fossil species whose scales have the same structure, Mr. Agassiz made his division of Ganoïdians, which already contains many hundred species, and promises to become still larger, since it predominates in all the formations anterior to the chalk. Mr. Agassiz recognizes several distinct families of this order; the two principal ones are the Sauroïdians, to which the *Lepidosteus* and the Bichir belong; and the *Lepidoïdians*, which were inoffensive and probably omnivorous fishes, somewhat resembling the Carp in appearance, but having no representatives in the present creation.

These researches among the fossils had not a geological interest alone. The numerous examinations that Mr. Agassiz was obliged to make, in order to establish in all points the analogy of extinct species with living types, revealed to him anatomical relations of great interest, which had been hitherto passed over. He thus discovered the important fact, not before made known, that there exists a remarkable parallelism between the development of the individual, and the development of the whole class in the series of ages. In the early stages of embryonic life, the vertebral column does not exist. In place of it there is found, in the embryo, a gelatinous mass, called the dorsal cord. Around this cord (which remains for a longer or shorter time in all fishes,) are formed the vertebræ, as bony rings. These rings gradually increase, and encroach more and more upon the dorsal cord, which, in most fishes, at last disappears. In some types, however, for example, in the Sturgeon, it remains during the whole life; so that this fish has no vertebræ, and the apophyses rest immediately on the dorsal cord. Now, Agassiz shows us that this is the case with all the fishes of former epochs. They all have distinct spinous apophyses, often very strong and completely ossified, but they show no trace of separate vertebræ; whence he concludes, that these organs were wanting, and that the dorsal cord continued throughout life, as in the Sturgeon. As to the relative superiority of living types, also, embryology reveals to us a wonderful parallelism. There is no fish, however imperfect, whose organization does not corre-

spend to some phase in the life of more perfect types. Take, for example, the Lamprey, or that still more imperfect fish known under the name of *Amphioxus*, or *Branchiostoma*, which Pallas placed among the Snails, from its great dissimilarity to ordinary fishes. The former has, in place of the cranium, only a cartilage corresponding to the base of the skull; and the latter is deprived even of this, and the dorsal cord extends to the end of the snout. The first has a single fin, more or less divided; in the other, the fin extends along the whole body. Finally, neither has jaws, properly so called. Now, the most perfect of our fishes, such, for example, as the Salmon, are all, at one period of their life, at the same point of development, but with them it is a transient state, a stage of growth; whilst in the others it is the permanent condition.

These views have a high philosophical bearing, particularly in their application to other classes of the animal kingdom. It is in accordance with them that Agassiz determined the rank to be assigned to the various families of fishes, according to their organization.

It is to Geology, nevertheless, that the greatest profit is derived from these discoveries. In comparing together the fishes found in various formations, Agassiz from the first had also thrown new light on the relative age of these formations. Thus, to cite but a single example, he was enabled by the study of the fishes of the slate of Glaris, to demonstrate that this deposit, which had previously been considered as belonging to the most ancient sedimentary rocks, the *grauwacké*, is much more recent, and forms a part of the cretaceous group. Another and more general result of his labors was the discovery, that not only are all the fossil species different from those now living, but also, that from one formation to another, the species are equally distinct. And this diversity, according to him, is not confined to the larger formations, but exists equally between the various stages of the same formation. Thus he recognizes no species as common to the lias and the upper Jura limestone; to the upper and lower cretaceous deposits; to the ancient and recent strata of the tertiary formations, &c. The necessary deduction is, that the whole creation has been renewed at different epochs, by a direct intervention of the Creator. Agassiz, however, did not stop here, but pushed his conclusions still further. From the fact that certain basins, like certain regions of the earth's surface, are inhabited by species peculiar to them, not found elsewhere

in deposits of the same age, he inferred that each creation was local, that is to say, that species were created in the localities they inhabit, and that to each was assigned a limit, which it does not pass so long as it remains in its natural condition. Man alone, and those few species that are associated with him, are exceptions to this general law. And as the migrations of even these species takes place under the direct influence of man, we may conclude that they were unknown to former epochs.

These considerations, with others not less important, concerning the relation which this localization bears to the temperature and degree of elevation of continents at different epochs, suggested to Agassiz some general reflections, with which he closes his chapter on Classification, and which we transcribe, as showing the spirit in which this work is written. "Such facts," says he, "loudly proclaim principles which science has hitherto left untouched, but which the researches of paleontology urge upon the observer, with an ever increasing force: those, I mean, that respect the relation of the Creator to the universe. We see phenomena closely connected in the order of succession, yet without any sufficient cause within themselves for the connection; an infinite diversity of species, without any material bond of union, so grouped as to present the most admirable progressive development, in which our own species is involved. Have we not here the most incontestable proofs of the existence of a Superior Intelligence, whose power alone has been able to establish such an order of things? The methods of scientific investigation, however, are of such strictness, that what seems to our feelings a matter of course, we cannot admit, unless supported by numerous and well-established facts; on this account, I have delayed expressing my convictions on this subject, until the last moment; not that I have wished to avoid the discussions which the announcement of such results must necessarily excite, but that I have been desirous not to provoke them before establishing for these results a purely scientific foundation, and supporting them by rigid demonstrations, rather than by a profession of faith. An acquaintance with more than fifteen hundred species of fossil fishes, has taught me that species do not pass insensibly into each other, but that they appear and disappear unexpectedly, without showing any immediate connection with those preceding them. For I do not think that any one can seriously affirm that the nu-

merous types of Cycloïdians and Ctenoïdians, which are almost contemporaneous, are descended from the Placoidians and Ganoïdians. This would be, in fact, to say, that Mammalia, and thus man, are directly descended from the fishes. All these species have a fixed time of appearance and disappearance; indeed, their existence is limited to a definite period. Nevertheless, they present, in their general character, affinities more or less close, and a definite coördination in a given system, intimately connected with the mode of life of each type, and even of each species. More than this, in all ages, an invisible thread runs through this immense diversity, presenting to us, as a definite result, a continual progress in this development, of which man is the end, the four classes of vertebrated animals the intermediate steps, and the invertebrata the constant accessory accompaniment. Have we not here the manifestations of a mind as powerful as prolific?—the acts of an intelligence as sublime as provident?—the marks of goodness as infinite as wise?—the most palpable demonstration of the existence of a personal God, author of all things, ruler of the universe, and dispenser of all good? This at least is what I read in the works of the creation, in contemplating them with a grateful heart. Such feelings, moreover, dispose us better to fathom the truth, and study it for itself; and it is my conviction, that if, in the study of the natural sciences, these questions were less avoided, even in the sphere of direct observation, our progress would be generally more sure and more rapid."

It is not astonishing that such results, accompanied by views so wide, and presented with the irresistible force of a profound conviction, gained for their author the respect of the scientific world. Learned societies vied in showing their sympathy with him; and, (a distinction then unparalleled,) at the age of thirty-four, Agassiz was a member of every scientific academy in Europe.

England was, at that time, in advance of all other nations in the study of Geology. It was here that Agassiz found at once the richest materials and the greatest encouragement. Whole collections were put at his disposal, and he obtained in this manner many precious specimens. Some of his friends recollect with pleasure the impression produced by his visit on the naturalists of the United Kingdom. Several universities were desirous of numbering him among their professors, and the cities of Edinburgh and Dublin, beside conferring on

him the degree of LL. D., enrolled him also among their citizens. We learn that his personal influence induced several persons of high rank to engage in the study of Natural History—among others, Sir Philip Egerton and Lord Enniskillen, whose collections are known to all paleontologists. He became intimate with the most influential persons in the kingdom; he was the welcome guest of Sir Robert Peel and Lord Egerton, and the friend of Buckland, Owen, Murchison, and other distinguished English naturalists.

Having obtained from the study of Fossil Fishes results so important to the history of the development of the whole creation, Agassiz naturally sought to confirm them by the study of other classes of animals, and, accordingly, applied himself to the examination of the Mollusca and the Echinodermata. The latter had been, in general, somewhat neglected by naturalists; the fossil species, in particular, were scarcely known, although, from their great variety, and the complicated structure of their shells, they are of great importance in determining the age of various deposits.

In a short time, he had collected a considerable number of species, belonging to various public and private collections throughout Europe, and in 1836 he published, in the first volume of the *Mémoires de la Société des Sciences Naturelles de Neuchâtel*, a Prodomus of the class of Echinodermata—the principles of which have since been generally adopted. The same volume contains another paper, giving descriptions and figures of the fossil Echini belonging to the Neocomian group* of the Neufchatel Jura. A year afterwards, he published, in another periodical,—(the *Mémoires de la Société Helvétique*,)—descriptions of the fossil Echini peculiar to Switzerland. In the same year appeared the first number of a more extensive work, having the title of “*Monographies d'Echinodermes*.” This number contained the monograph of the *Saleniæ*, small Echini belonging to the chalk. It was followed by three others, treating of the *Scutellæ*, the *Galerites*, and the anatomy of the Echinus,—the last number edited by M. Valentin. To facilitate the study of these curious animals, so important to the history of successive creations, Agassiz made casts in plaster of all the specimens in his possession. This collection comprises casts of nearly five

* A formation belonging to the lower green-sand, near Neufchatel, from the Latin name of which city it derives its name.

hundred species, the counterparts of which are to be found in the great museums in Europe, and has thus become one of the most precious documents we possess concerning this class of animals.

The labors of Mr. Agassiz on Fossil Shells are not less important. A young Swiss geologist, M. Gressly, had made a considerable collection of fossil shells from all the stages of the oolitic and cretaceous formations. Mr. Agassiz commenced the publication of them in a work entitled "*Etudes critiques sur les Mollusques fossiles du Jura et de la Craie.*" Of this, four numbers have appeared, with a hundred quarto plates, comprising the group of the *Trygonia* and that of the *Myæ*. At the same time Agassiz published a German translation of Buckland's Geology, with numerous notes and additions, and revised the French and German translations of Sowerby's Mineral Conchology.

But whatever may be any man's ability and energy, Nature has fixed certain limits to what it is possible for him to accomplish, which he cannot pass. Thus, in order to explain the rapid succession, at so short intervals, of the works we have mentioned, and those of which we have yet to speak, we must observe, that about this time, (1837,) Agassiz associated with himself a young naturalist, Mr. Desor,—who has ever since labored with him and under his direction, and who, having accompanied him in all his Alpine excursions, and in his visit to this country, is now living among us. To the information personally furnished by Mr. Desor, as well as to his writings, we are indebted for much of the present sketch, which could not have been written without his assistance.

The united labors of the two friends accomplished what would have been beyond the reach of a single individual, and the fruits of these labors we see in these numerous publications.

The reputation of Mr. Agassiz, and his unwearying energy, transformed the little town of Neufchatel into a nursery of science—to the great astonishment of the peaceful burghers, who, for the most part, could not at all comprehend what was going on around them. But the more enlightened among them soon gathered about him, and thus a Society of Natural History was formed, that soon drew attention by its activity. The Museum, established by the liberality of some of the citizens, increased rapidly. At the recommendation of Mr. Agassiz, a young naturalist, a pupil of his, Mr. Tschudi,—

since known by his work on Peru,—was despatched on a voyage round the world, to collect objects of Natural History.

The influence which Agassiz exercised was not confined to the town where he lived. He succeeded also in reviving the zeal of the "*Société Helvétique des Sciences Naturelles*," of which he was one of the directors. It was in consequence of his exertions that this society resumed with renewed vigor its publications, which had languished for some time for want of nourishment.

His studies of the Fossils did not make Agassiz forget the Fishes, which have always been, and still are, his favorites. He continued to collect materials for his "Natural History of the Fresh-water Fishes of Europe." His portfolios now contained a complete series of drawings, executed with the greatest care by Mr. Dinkel, the skilful draughtsman whom he had educated at Munich. Having formed at Neufchatel a lithographic establishment, in which there were several distinguished artists, he determined to commence the publication of his work. The plates of the magnificent Atlas—which justly ranks among the first works in this department*—were struck off under his eye at Neufchatel. It is on this account only the more to be regretted, that, after having exhausted all his pecuniary resources, to make this publication worthy of its name, the author found it impossible to continue it on the plan projected. Nevertheless, science has been partly indemnified by the publication of the Embryology of the Salmon tribe, which forms the second number of the work.

After the attention which German naturalists had given to the study of this important and interesting branch of science, Agassiz determined that his Fishes also should contribute their share. He therefore employed his friend, Mr. Vogt, (now Professor of Zoölogy at the University of Giessen,) who, under his direction, elaborated this part of the work, which is justly esteemed by all physiologists. A third part of the same work,—the Anatomy of the Salmon,—the fruit of the joint labors of Messrs. Agassiz and Vogt, has since appeared in the third volume of the Memoirs of the Neufchatel Society, with a large number of admirably executed plates.

Mr. Agassiz had finished the publication of the "Fossil

* We may add, that, in the opinion of Mr. Agassiz, the execution of these plates has been surpassed only in one work, the Ichthyology of the United States Exploring Expedition.

Fishes." But though the book was finished, the subject was not exhausted. Numerous contributions poured in from all quarters. The study of the Devonian system, in particular, had made known a whole ichthyological fauna of a peculiar character. Mr. Agassiz was requested by the British Association to publish these interesting remains. This he did in a First Supplement to the "*Poissons Fossiles*"—under the name of the "Fishes of the Devonian System." About the same time he presented to the British Association his Report on the Fishes of the London Clay.

After the publication of the "Fresh-water Fishes," there appeared a work of a different character, and which of itself would be sufficient to establish the reputation of a naturalist. This is the "*Nomenclator Zoologicus*"—an enumeration of all the genera in the animal kingdom, with an indication of the etymology of their names,—of the author by whom the names were proposed,—the date of their publication,—and the family to which they should be referred.

From the commencement of his career, Agassiz had been struck by the disorder that pervaded zoölogical nomenclature, and the confusion resulting from the application of the same name to totally different animals. To remedy this difficulty, he prepared registers, in which he entered the names of all animals as they occurred to him in his studies. After having continued this practice for more than ten years, he arranged the names methodically, and published the nomenclature of each class separately, after having it revised by the naturalists most distinguished throughout Europe in each special branch. The *Nomenclator Zoologicus* is preceded by an introduction in Latin, in which the general principles of nomenclature are profoundly discussed, and it has become an authority universally acknowledged. In connection with this work we must mention another publication, more extensive and not less important—the "*Bibliographie générale d'histoire naturelle*;" which grew up in a similar manner by the side of the *Nomenclator*. It contains a list of the authors cited in the former work, with bibliographical notices, and is in course of publication, at the expense of the Ray Society. This work will form several large volumes;—the first numbers, containing a list of the publications of scientific institutions, have recently appeared.

We come now to speak of a series of discoveries which have particularly tended to make the name of Agassiz known to the

public in general, and from which resulted his Glacial theory. This theory is so generally known, that it may be interesting to relate, in a few words, its origin and the different phases in which it has appeared. Although now of so wide application, (extending to the whole northern hemisphere, as far as erratic boulders and polished rocks are found,) its first origin is to be sought in the Alps. It was among the chamois-hunters of the Valais that the idea arose, that masses of rock were transported by glaciers. These men, accustomed to live in the high regions of the Alps, and seeing every year enormous masses of rock transported to a distance from their original position by the glaciers, found no difficulty in supposing that *all* the boulders which are found in the valleys had been transported thither in the same manner; and as they had observed the *oscillation* of the extremities of the glaciers,—that is to say, their advance in one year and their recession in the next,—they concluded, in like manner, that, at the period when the blocks now found at a distance from the glaciers were first detached, the glaciers themselves must have reached further than at present.

These notions, however, had not extended beyond the limits of the Alpine valleys. M. Venetz, an engineer of the Valais, was the first to undertake an application of them, in a treatise on the subject, in which he showed, that at various periods since the end of the last century the glaciers had extended further than at present, and in retiring had left everywhere heaps of stones and large rocks, as marks of their presence. Afterwards, M. de Charpentier conceived the idea of extending the application of these facts beyond the region of the present glaciers. He advanced the hypothesis, that the distribution of the boulders which are scattered over the valley of Switzerland* and on the sides of the Jura, may be accounted for in this way. This opinion, which he expressed in a brief treatise, was received with almost unanimous incredulity; so generally adopted was Saussure's theory, which accounted for these phenomena by the supposition that the Alpine chain had formerly been broken through at various points, allowing vast lakes, before shut up within its walls, to escape with violence.†

* The northern part of Switzerland, between the Bernese Oberland and the Jura, goes by this name.

† For some account of Saussure's theory see Lyell's *Elements of Geology*, American edition, Vol. I., p. 245.

Mr. Agassiz, as we hear, was among the skeptics, and, in 1836, visited M. de Charpentier, with the view of persuading his friend to relinquish an hypothesis which he considered untenable. But the latter, instead of entering into a discussion, conducted Agassiz to the places themselves, on the Mer de Glace, at Chamouni, where his observations had been made. He showed him the glacier actually at work in transporting boulders, and in its passage polishing and rounding the rocks at its sides. A light now burst upon the mind of Mr. Agassiz: not only did he admit that the blocks found in the valley of Switzerland might have been carried thither in this manner, but he saw moreover at a glance the immense bearing of this fact, and the effect it must necessarily have on the science of Geology.

And indeed, in order that the Alpine glaciers should extend to the Jura, so as to deposit these blocks at the elevation of four thousand feet, the valley of Switzerland must have been covered with ice at least two thousand five hundred feet thick. Now such an accumulation of ice could not be the effect of a local cause. The depression of temperature necessary to account for this extension of these glaciers, must have made itself felt elsewhere, and this with an intensity increasing towards the north. Now as the soil of Scandinavia presents the same marks of friction as the sides of the Alps and the Jura, accompanied also by erratic boulders, the conclusion was deduced, that all the north of Europe must have been covered by a vast sheet of ice, in the same manner as the polar regions are at present. The formation of this sheet of ice, in consequence of a sudden depression of the temperature, it was insisted, must have put an end to the tertiary epoch, by annihilating the animals and plants then existing.

Such was the original form of the Glacial Theory, which was first announced in a discourse of Mr. Agassiz, in 1837, at the opening of the meeting of the *Société Helvétique*, held at Neufchatel. The opposition excited by M. de Charpentier's theory, (which only extended the glaciers of the Alps as far as the Jura,) was roused in a tenfold degree by that of Mr. Agassiz. As is always the case when a new truth dawns upon the world, two parties were immediately formed; one embracing the new doctrine with enthusiasm, the other furiously opposing it. Disputes arose even concerning the present glaciers. It was denied that they were capable of polishing and scratching rocks. Doubts were raised as to the mode in which they advanced, and as the very fact of their advance rested

solely on public notoriety, it was demanded that their movement should be shown by direct observations, before any conclusions were drawn from it. A problem before purely geological, was thus suddenly changed into a question of fact, requiring a long series of researches and experiments.

Though already overburdened by his various labors, Agassiz did not shrink from this task. He saw at once, that to obtain a satisfactory solution it was not enough to have such isolated observations as can be made in short visit. It was necessary to examine the glaciers not only at their termination, but also throughout their whole extent; to ascertain the influence of inequalities of the soil on their movements; the temperature of the ice and the effect of external agencies upon it, under all circumstances. In a word, it was necessary to do what had never been done before; namely, to establish an intimate acquaintance with the glaciers.

Mr. Agassiz, after having visited in succession most of the glaciers, fixed his head-quarters at the Glacier of the Aar, whither he went for eight years consecutively, with his friends, to pass his summer vacations,—at first with no shelter except a large boulder lying on the middle of the glacier, and which soon became famous under the name of the *Hôtel des Neuchâtelois*. Afterwards he built a little stone cabin on the left margin of the glacier;—this received the name of “the Pavilion.” Here he prosecuted the long series of researches that have obtained so much celebrity in the scientific world.

Although his retreat was situated eight thousand feet above the level of the sea, and twelve miles from any habitation, it was soon well known throughout the country, and there might often be seen assembled a select company, in which all nations were worthily represented.

The scientific results obtained from these investigations are contained in two works. The first, published in 1840, under the title of “*Etudes sur les Glaciers*,” comprises a description, with plates, of the principal phenomena connected with the glaciers, together with a detailed account of the author’s views as to their former extent. The second, recently published, under the name of “*Système glaciaire*,” is the last, and seems to us likely to be one of the most successful works of the author; it contains a detailed account of the investigations made during his last five visits, (from 1841 to 1845,) with the view to determine the mode of progression of the glaciers in all parts of their course, at all seasons of the year, and under all conditions of temperature. This work is accompanied by beau-

tiful plates, and a topographical chart of the Glacier of the Aar, on a very large scale, ($\frac{1}{10,000}$), allowing even the minutest details of the surface to be given, so that this glacier is better known, in a topographical point of view, than any canton or state.

We cannot, of course, undertake an analysis of the results obtained from all these observations, and summed up at the end of each chapter. We will only say, that this work, if we mistake not, is to be considered as a sort of introduction to a more extensive undertaking, for which the author has already collected a great number of materials, and which is to comprise the history of the last great revolutions which the earth's surface has undergone. We understand that Mr. Agassiz finds in this country a vast field for research, and valuable materials in the works of American geologists.

Referring those of our readers who are desirous of particular information on this matter, to the above work, we conclude our sketch with a single passage of a different character, from a little volume by Mr. Desor, entitled "*Excursions et séjours de M. Agassiz et de ses compagnons de voyage, dans les Glaciers et les hautes régions des Alpes*,"*—containing a lively and readable account of the incidents and adventures of their mountain-life, as well as of the topography and scenery of the country, and from which (did our limits allow,) we would gladly make larger extracts. It is easy to conceive, that, living in the midst of the magnificent peaks by which the Glacier of the Aar is surrounded, the temptation to scale their dizzy heights must be strong, especially when fortified by a scientific interest. Mr. Desor gives accounts of various ascents undertaken by their little company; the most memorable of which is that of the Jungfrau, which took place in 1841; having for its object the study of the structure of the snow and ice on the higher summits. The Jungfrau is the most admired of the Swiss mountains, and next to the Finsteraarhorn, Mont Blanc, and the Monte Rosa—the highest of the Alps, being 13,720 feet in elevation. We extract from the abovementioned work some particulars of this ascent, which was much talked of among the mountaineers; since, by many of them, the Jungfrau was considered inaccessible. Starting from the hamlet of Ménil, on the Viesch Glacier, at

* Neufchatel and Paris. 1844. 18mo. For many interesting details, among others the account of a descent into one of the crevices of the glacier, to examine its structure, see an article by Mr. Agassiz himself, in the *Edinb. New Phil. Journal*, for 1842.

five o'clock, a. m., Mr. Agassiz and his companions arrived, at two, p. m., at the base of the highest summit, the inclination of which, on being measured, was found to be forty-five degrees. This declivity, moreover, was covered with hard, slippery ice, in which it was necessary to cut steps; and this, together with the intense cold, so retarded their progress, that, at one time, they advanced only fifteen steps in a quarter of an hour. The summit formed the vertical section of a cone; and the ice being less hard at the edge of the precipice, they walked, by the advice of their guide, on the very brink of the abyss. "Several times," says Mr. Desor, "on thrusting out my staff rather further than usual, I felt it pass through the roof of snow,"—which, as is usually the case, projected like a cornice from the edge of the precipice,—“and then we could look, (whenever the fog separated for a moment,) perpendicularly through the hole into the vast gulf below.” The fog, which had hidden every thing from sight, cleared away when they reached the summit, at about four, p. m. “Here, for the first time, we had a view of the valley of Switzerland; we were on the western edge of the section of the cone, having at our feet the barrier that separates the valley of Lauterbrunnen from that of Grindelwald. . . . The mountain here forms an abrupt angle, a dozen feet below the summit, and we saw, with a sort of affright, that the space which separated us from the highest point was a sharp ridge, about twenty feet long, the sides of which had an inclination of from sixty to seventy degrees. ‘There is no way of getting there,’ said Agassiz, and we all inclined to the same opinion. Jacob, [their principal guide,] on the contrary, said there was no difficulty whatever, and that we should all get over. Laying aside what he carried, he commenced the undertaking by passing his staff over the ridge, so as to bring it under his right arm, and thus climbed along the western slope, burying his feet as much as possible in the snow, in order to obtain foothold.” In this way he passed over, and after having removed the snow from the summit, persuaded them all to follow. “The summit is a very narrow triangular space, about two feet long, and a foot and a half wide, with the base towards the valley of Switzerland. As there was room only for one person, we took turns. Agassiz mounted first, resting on Jacob’s arm. He remained about five minutes, and when he rejoined us, I saw he was unable to suppress the vivid emotion caused by the overwhelming grandeur of the spectacle.”

‘It is not the vast prospect that makes the charm of the higher mountains. We had already found from former experience, that distant views are generally indistinct. Here, on the summit of the Jungfrau, the contours of the distant mountains were still less defined. But what fascinated us was the spectacle in our immediate neighbourhood. Before us was spread out the valley of Switzerland, and at our feet were piled up the lower chains, the apparent uniformity of whose height gave still greater sublimity to the vast peaks that towered up almost to our level. At the same time, the valleys of the Oberland, which, until now, had been covered by light vapor, were uncovered in several places, ‘revealing to us through the fissures the world below.’ We distinguished on the right the valley of Grindelwald; on the left, far below, an immense chasm, at the bottom of which a brilliant thread wound along, following its windings. This was the valley of Lauterbrunnen, with the river Lutschinen. . . . On the south the view was interrupted by clouds, which had for some hours been gathering on the Monte Rosa. We were recompensed for this, however, by a very extraordinary phenomenon, which took place under our eyes and interested us much. A thick mist had gathered on our left, towards the southwest; it ascended constantly from the Rott-thal, and began to extend to the northward. We already feared lest it should surround us a second time, when we found that it terminated abruptly at the distance of a few feet from us. Owing to this circumstance, we beheld before us a vertical wall of mist, the height of which we estimated to be at least from 12,000 to 15,000 feet, since it rose from the valley of Lauterbrunnen to a considerable distance above our heads. As its temperature was below the freezing point, the little particles of vapor were transformed into crystals of ice, and reflected the sun’s rays in all the colors of the rainbow; we seemed to be surrounded by a mist of gold.”

The scientific results of this ascension were — the discovery that the snow, even on the highest summits, is not changed into ice, though it rests on a crust of very compact ice; also, that the summit of the Jungfrau is gneiss, and not limestone, as had been supposed. Among the lichens gathered by Mr. Agassiz at the summit, was a new species (*Umbilicaria Virginis*, Schær.); — the others were among those found by Saussure on Mont Blanc.

The general features of Mr. Agassiz’ history since 1845

are probably known to most of our readers. In the fall of 1846, being charged with a scientific exploration by the king of Prussia, and having also received an invitation to lecture before the Lowell Institute, he arrived in this country, where he has since resided. On the establishment of the Lawrence Scientific School, at Cambridge, the professorship of Zoölogy and Geology was offered to him, and after some deliberation accepted. Of the results of his labors in this country it is yet too soon to speak; but the impulse given to these studies by his presence is a matter of public notoriety, and of the highest importance to scientific culture among us.

In conclusion we give a chronological list of the most important of Mr. Agassiz' works.

Spix et Agassiz, selecta genera et species Piscium, quos in itinere per Brasiliam annis MDCCCXVII-XX peracto collegit et pingendos curavit. 2 vol. cum 55 Tab. lithogr. et 46 Tab. col. Munich. 1829-31.—Recherches sur les Poissons fossiles. Soleure. 1833-43. 5 vols., 4to, et 5 vols. Planches, fol.—W. Buckland, Geologie u. Mineralogie in Beziehung z. natürl. Theologie. Aus d. Engl. übers mit Anm. u. Zusatz v. L. Agassiz. Neufchatel. 1838. Mit 69 Tafeln. 2 Bde. 8vo.—Description des Echinodermes fossiles de la Suisse. Soleure. 1839-40. Avec 25 Pl. 4to.—Monographies d'Echinodermes vivans et fossiles. Soleure. 1838-40. 4 vols. 4to.—Etudes critiques sur les Mollusques fossiles. 1840-45. 4to.—Histoire naturelle des poissons d'eau douce de l'Europe centrale. Soleure. 1839-40. Fol.—Mémoire sur les moules de Mollusques vivans et fossiles. Soleure. 1840-42. 4to.—Etudes sur les glaciers. Soleure. 1840. 8vo. 8 vols. Avec 32 Pl. fol. [Also the same work in a German translation.]—Nomenclator Zoölogicus, seu nomina generica generum animalium tam viventium quam fossilium. Soleure. 1842-1846. 4to.—Monographies des Poissons fossiles du système Dévonien. 1844-45. 4 vols. fol. Avec un Atlas.—Iconographie des coquilles tertiaires. Dans les Mém. de la Soc. Helv. des Sc. Nat. Vol. 7. 1845.—Bibliographia hist. naturalis. [In publication by the Ray Society.]—Système glaciaire, ou recherches sur les glaciaires et leur mécanisme. Avec un Atlas. Paris. 1847.—Catalogue raisonné des Echinides vivans et fossiles, par MM. Agassiz et Desor. [Annal. des Sc. Naturelles, 1847.]

Mr. Agassiz has also prepared (by request) an elementary work on Natural History, which is now in course of publication.

ART. V.—SHORT REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

- 1.—1. *Phonotypy. A Report to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.* Cambridge. 1847.
2. *Significance of the Alphabet.* By C. KRAITSIR, M. D. Published by E. P. Peabody. Boston. 1846.
3. *First Book of English, founded on the Significance of the Alphabet,* by C. KRAITSIR, M. D.

AN orthography of English, properly speaking, has never had existence. The gentlemen of the American Academy, who have put forth the report in favor of Phonotypy, state very clearly the disadvantages resulting from the extreme contradiction at present existing between the writing and the pronunciation. But they have not investigated the origin and history of this discrepancy, nor shown the comparative truth to the nature of language, of the writing and pronunciation; and hence the remedy they suggest is worse than the evil, for it involves a sanction and extension of every abuse of the latter, which has the chance of present fashion in its favor; it precludes future return towards the general standard of the Indo-European tongues, in pronunciation; and, what is worse than all, it annihilates that truth to the eye which the language in a great degree still preserves, by being written with letters indicating the natural growth of the words from roots common to the whole family of languages to which it belongs.

We therefore would call attention to Dr. Kraitsir's pamphlet on the "Significance of the Alphabet," as well as to the "First Book of English," which he has published. The latter, notwithstanding some carelessness evinced in the composition of the vocabularies, is conceived in a more scientific spirit, and suggests more fundamental ideas than any primer we have seen.

In the "Significance of the Alphabet," Dr. Kraitsir shows that the Latin arrangement of the visible signs of sounds was made with reference to the organs which made the sounds respectively; and that these organs severally imitate the things, and symbolize the ideas, which are the subject of speech: consequently, that the sounds they make are significant. And, in the "First Book of English," he states, as a first principle, that *the great secret of language* is this; namely, that the sounds articulated by the lips, tongue, throat, and teeth, signify exactly what these organs symbolize to the senses and imagination.

If this is the case, and if, as he states, the alphabets used by the Indo-European nations classify sounds according to their organic origin and significance, an importance is given to these schemes of writing, in the eyes of the philologist and philosopher,

which Phonotypy does not respect, but which claims the careful investigation of both its defenders and opposers.

Dr. Kraitsir has yet to unfold, in a "Second Book of English," the practical bearings of his idea upon the treatment of the English language. In his treatise on the "significance," he has merely spoken of the alphabet we use as affording a perfect standard of Latin pronunciation, for which language it was invented. The views and arguments with respect to the pronunciation of Latin are not new, except in this country. Karl Ottfried Müller adopted this pronunciation in his lectures in Göttingen, and, in fact, it is now generally recognized as having the analogy of the language and the authority of the old Roman grammarians in its favor. Even in England, Scheller's Latin Grammar has been translated, and the translator adds to the proofs adduced by Scheller, others of his own; and Dr. Ainsworth long ago, in his dictionary, gives us the same views.

But Dr. Kraitsir goes to the root of the matter, in pointing out the organic significance of the sounds, and showing the bearings of the true pronunciation of Latin upon the establishment of a standard of radical meanings, and the laws that identify words in all the Indo-European languages.

The possibility of establishing this standard, and discovering these laws, which may be used as keys to unlock the vital treasures of that immense family of languages, containing the highest results of human civilization, gives the subject such an interest as might ensure for it the attentive study, not only of professed scholars, but of practical men, to whom it becomes yearly of more importance to speak in a variety of tongues. The suggestion of the Promptuary, (pp. 26, 27,) containing a comparative anatomy of languages, opens a new world to every man of common-sense, no less than to the philologist and philosopher.

Among the many trains of interesting thought suggested by these works, we have room only to advert to that point, in which they seem to cross the path of the phonotypists.

Dr. Kraitsir recognizes all the inconveniences of the discordance of the writing and pronunciation of English pointed out by the Report of the Academy, and touches upon others of more importance still; and, although he maintains that the English writing is less corrupted than the pronunciation, and is rather to be preserved of the two, he admits and even suggests some reform in the writing.

Since the Latin alphabet is confessedly not adequate to the perspicuous writing of the English tongue, which contains eight more vowels, and five more consonants, than the Latin, he would enlarge it by a system of *pointing*, as the Poles did, when they undertook to write their language with Latin letters. He suggests that the *a* in *man*, *o* in *not* and *nor*, *e* in *err*, *i* in *fir*, and *u*

in *fur* should have each a dot placed under them; and *u* in *fun* two dots. This would make a character for every vowel, for Dr. Kraitsir does not admit that mere quantity of sound changes the vowel. To the guttural division of the alphabet he would add *c* with a dot under it, to represent the consonant *ch* in *church*. To the lingua-dental division he would add *s* with a dot under it, to represent the *sh* in *ship*, and a *z* with a dot under it, to represent the first consonant sound in *osier*. To represent the *th* in *this* he suggests that either the Anglo-Saxon character be restored, or a *d* with a dot under it used; and for *th* in *thin*, either the Anglo-Saxon character or a dot under *t*.

These twelve additional characters would represent all the sounds of the English language; rendering the present characters not obsolete or obscure, but more clear and perspicuous, and then a great deal of the English language could be written as it is spelt.

But this last should not be done indiscriminately. There are many silent consonants in English writing, which should be preserved, because they indicate sounds that have a meaning; and the vowels *i* and *u* are often indicative of sunken consonants, and must be, in those instances, carefully preserved.

It is proper also to remark, that although Dr. Kraitsir suggests this reform in printing, it is not at all essential in his eyes. When languages are studied on the philological principle, the inconveniences of the anomalous writing of English are of less consequence.

We were quite surprised to find, from the "First Book of English," how seldom the soft sounds of *c* and *g* occur in the language. Dr. Kraitsir affirms that they never occur except in derivations from the corruptly pronounced Latin of the middle ages, or in importations from the French. In the Anglo-Saxon words, *girl*, *gird*, *get*, &c., we have *g* hard before *e* and *i* as well as before *a*, *o*, and *u*. We would suggest, that, if the writing be reformed, a dot should be placed over *c* and *g*, wherever they are soft, to facilitate the reading of the language to children and foreigners.

The space allowed has compelled us to abbreviate what we have hinted at, and we can only add, that the suggestion of pointing the letters of the Latin alphabet to represent those sounds of the English which are not found in Latin, has this unquestionable advantage over the scheme of the phonographers; that it is in analogy with the organism and in harmony with the significance of the language, and suggests to scholars true standards of pronunciation and meaning.

2. — *Prison Life and Reflections, or, a Narrative of the Arrest, Trial, Conviction, Imprisonment, Treatment, Observations, Reflections, and Deliverance, of Work, Burr, and Thompson, who suffered an unjust and cruel imprisonment in the Missouri Penitentiary, for attempting to aid some slaves to liberty.* Three parts in one volume. By GEORGE THOMPSON, one of the prisoners. Oberlin: Printed by James M. Fitch. 1847. 12mo. pp. xvi and 417.

THE above title is sufficiently descriptive of the work.

-
3. — *The Characteristics of the Present Age.* By JOHANN GOTTLIEB FICHTE. Translated from the German by WILLIAM SMITH. London: John Chapman. 1847. 12mo. pp. xvi and 271.

Two years ago Mr. Smith translated another work of Fichte, "The Nature of the Scholar," to which he prefixed a short but beautiful memoir of its author, and last year Mrs. Percy Sinnett translated his "Destination of Man." Fichte thus is likely to become well known to English readers. The present volume contains seventeen lectures on the following subjects: Idea of universal history; a general and minute delineation of the present age and its scientific condition; the Life according to Reason; earlier conditions of the scientific or literary world, and its ideal condition; Mysticism as a phenomenon of the present age; the origin and limits of History; the absolute form and historical development of the State; Influence of Christianity on the State; Development of the State in modern Europe; Public Morality and Public Religion of the present age; Conclusion. He promises also to translate Fichte's "Doctrine of Religion," the ablest and most celebrated of all his works. The translation is more free than literal.

-
4. — *A Vindication of Protestant Principles.* By Phileleutherus Anglicanus. Nihil tam tectum est, quod non sit detegendum, non semper pendebit inter latrones Christus: resurget aliquando crucifixa veritas. London: John W. Parker. 1847. 8vo. pp. xvi and 194.

THIS is the work of some man who has read much amongst philosophical and theological writers, and has thought much. He thinks William of Ockham originated the Protestant principles; that Luther and Bucer were not the main springs of the Reforma-

tion in England, but the revival of letters and the influence of Melancthon. The articles of the English church have a "comprehensive Protestantism." However, he admits errors in the church establishment, but thinks the Puritans mainly to be blamed for their existence. The most important feature of the book is the author's opposition to all worship of the Bible. He considers that Strauss has overthrown rationalism on the one hand, and verbal inspiration on the other; at the same time he thinks "the Scriptures deliver an authoritative message from God to man, in regard to all matters of essential and religious truth, therein set forth," and thinks the gradual development of religious truth was terminated by the final revelation of the gospel. After a good deal of good-humored discussion and learned talk, he comes to the conclusion, "that it is the duty of all rational men, who are subjects of the British crown, to enter the widely-spread portals of the national church, which allows full scope for the free exercise of the privilege" of reading the Scriptures, "and treats with enlightened tolerance every unimportant modification of religious sentiments." He "cannot understand why any one who acquiesces in the judicial authority of the Lord Chancellor should object to the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury." The author has but a poor appreciation of the doctrine of the Trinity.

5. — *Endeavours after the Christian Life.* Discourses by JAMES MARTINEAU. Vol. II. London. 1847. 12mo. pp. XII and 349.

THE first volume of the "Endeavours" was published in 1843, and has been republished and extensively read in America. This work is thus worthily dedicated: "To Rev. John Hamilton Thom, this volume, the expression of a heart enlarged by his friendship and often aided by his wisdom, is dedicated, in memory of many labors lightened by partnership, purposes invigorated by sympathy, and the vicissitudes of years balanced by constancy of affection." This volume contains twenty-one sermons, with the following titles: Where is thy God? The Sorrow with downward Look; The Shadow of Death; Great Hopes for great Souls; Lo! God is here; Christian Self-consciousness; The unclouded Heart; Help Thou mine Unbelief; Having, Doing, and Being; The Freeman of Christ; The Good Soldier of Jesus Christ; The Realm of Order; The Christian Doctrine of Merit; The Child's Thought; Looking up and Lifting up; The Christian Time-view; The Family in Heaven and Earth; The Single and the Evil Eye; The Seven Sleepers; The Sphere of Silence — 1.

Man's, 2. God's. It is very refreshing to find a volume of sermons so bright, so original, so profound and beautiful as these. Somebody says the day of reading sermons is over — though not the day of preaching them. These are sermons which would command readers in any age — and still more in this, when sectarian dulness and flexible ethics are about all that one looks for in the desk. We have found in this volume nothing in the least degree sectarian, all is large and liberal; there is piety without silliness, wisdom without conceit, and humanity with no mawkish sentimentalism. We can only say to the author, Send us more.

6. — *Washington and his Generals; or, Legends of the Revolution.* By GEORGE LIPPARD, Author of *Ladye Annabel*, *The Quaker City*, *Blanche of Brandywine*, *Herbert Tracy*, *The Nazarene*, or the last of the Washingtons, &c. With an Introductory Essay by REV. C. CHAUNCEY BURR. Philadelphia. 1847. 8vo. pp. xxviii and 538.

In this work and the others from the same pen, we discover traces of a man of superior abilities; of a noble and generous nature. But he seems ill at ease, stung, perhaps, by misfortune, or by neglect, by seeing the wrongs of the world, and the men who fatten upon those wrongs. He writes often from an inferior motive, yet always in the interest of mankind, showing a ready sympathy with justice, mercy, and unaffected trust in God. He does not seem at peace with himself or with the world. There are many things in his works which we are sorry to see, for his many excellences show the ability to do better things. Some day we shall hope for a work better than his terrible paintings of crime and sin in "*The Quaker City*." But he never makes vice lovely. The monster certainly has a "frightful mien," yet the moral effect of such a book as that is more than questionable to us. We can understand how Schiller could write his "*Robbers*," easier than we can read the play a second time; and are not pleased to see an able man writing from such an impulse. Even "*The Quaker City*" has scenes of great power and unexceptionable excellence.

The *Legends of the Revolution* extend over but a small part of the whole war, and relate mainly to the battle of Germantown, the life of Benedict Arnold, the battle of Brandywine, and the declaration of Independence. It contains many fine scenes, though the descriptions are too full, and the phraseology too intense, to suit a classic taste.

7. — *Narrative of an Exploratory Visit to each of the Consular Cities of China and to the Islands of Hong-Kong and Chusan, in behalf of the Church Missionary Society, in the years 1844, 1845, 1846.* By the REV. GEORGE SMITH, M. A., of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and late missionary to China. London. 1847. 8vo. pp. xxiv and 532.

MR. Smith visited Canton "to ascertain the precise nature of local facilities for Missionary enterprise," and "to procure a native teacher of the mandarin or court dialect." The book is marked by ignorance, conceit, and bigotry, and contains but little information of any value to the general reader. Mr. Smith conversed with a Parsee on religious subjects, and, desirous of overwhelming the heathen, "singling out especially an emaciated form of infant suffering, we once asked him how on any other hypothesis than that of the *entrance of sin into the world and the fall of man*, he could regard misery at so early an age as compatible with the infinite benevolence of the Creator. He seemed to feel the force of the argument; but endeavoured to evade it by suddenly asking us how it was there were so many sects of Christians."

One day Mr. Smith visited a Buddhist: the priests came up and "intimated their desire" that he "would give them tobacco." "We made known to them," adds the author, "that we had no such gift for them, but offered them some copies of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and a tract, entitled 'The Way of Eternal Blessedness.'" One Chinaman told him that since the war with England the Chinese "were more disinclined than formerly to listen to Christian doctrine; thinking that if Englishmen were Christians it could not be a good religion which permitted them to be so insolent and mischievous." Another said, "Perhaps this English doctrine may be very good; but we wish that you would try it first on the English themselves, for they are wicked men; when this doctrine has made them better, then come and speak to us."

"My Chinese boy more than once on the voyage, [to Shanghai in a vessel carrying seven hundred and fifty boxes of opium, valued at about \$750,000] asked me whether I knew there was opium on board, and what I should say in reply to the Chinese, if, after hearing me speak to them about . . . 'Jesus' doctrines,' they should ask why I had come in a ship that brought opium, of which so many of his countrymen ate and perished." The missionary does not tell us how he "evaded" these remarks. He gives rather a tame picture of the opium-ships, and a much mitigated statement of the effect of the drug. On the other hand, he exaggerates the number of cases of infanticide: "out of four daughters poor men generally murdered two, and sometimes even three."

8. — *The True Story of my Life ; a Sketch by Hans Christian Andersen.* Translated by MARY HOWITT. Boston : James Munroe & Co. 1847. 12mo. pp. viii and 298.

THIS is a simple and unaffected little autobiography. It is full of delicate little touches of nature, not without a good-humored satire. The occasional notices of the distinguished men of the time — such as Thorwaldsen, Oehlenschläger, Grimm, Goethe, and others — enhance the variety and liveliness of the story. Andersen was once troubled by a swarm of critics, and thus writes of them. "The newspaper criticism in Copenhagen was infinitely stupid. It was set down as an exaggeration, that I could have seen the whole round blue globe of the moon in Smyrna, at the time of the new moon. That was called fancy and extravagance, which there any one sees who can open his eyes." — p. 157. He was not wholly above such criticism, but "felt a desire to flagellate such wet dogs, who come into our rooms and lay themselves down in the best place in them." — p. 158. He everywhere gives indications of a warm, humane, generous heart — though possessed of no very lofty poetic imagination. His little stories for children have a certain grace and charmingness about them, which can only come from a man's experience combined with a childlike simplicity.

-
- 9 — *Views of Christian Nurture and subjects adjacent thereto.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. Hartford. 1847. 12mo. pp. 252.

THIS volume contains two discourses on Christian nurture, designed to show, that if you educate the religious nature of a child the child will commonly turn out a religious man, without needing to go through the process of transformation in a "revival." The child is "to grow up a Christian," and at last will be a Christian grown up, not a Christian made up. He thinks with Baxter, that "education is as properly a means of grace as preaching." Then follows an argument for "Discourses on Christian Nurture," a tract originally "addressed to the publishing committee of the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society," who had printed his discourses and then suppressed them. The argument is sharp and convincing, but, considering the weakness of the persons addressed, perhaps a little too hard and cutting.

Then comes a paper on the "Spiritual economy of Revivals ;" another, entitled "Growth, not Conquest, the true Method of Christian Progress ;" a third, called "The Organic Unity of the Family ;" a fourth, on "The Scene of the Pentecost and the Christian Parish," and a "Note," defending himself against cer-

tain misrepresentations. We need scarcely say that Dr. Bushnell is pastor of a church in Hartford, Conn., of what is commonly called the Orthodox denomination, nor that at this day he is one of the brightest ornaments of that denomination itself. He is what may be called a "liberal Christian," holding fast to his own theory, but allowing other men to do the same for themselves. In this book, and in the numerous sermons he has published, we find talents of a high order united with a genuine Christian piety. His style is fresh and vigorous, original, always manly and often eloquent. The appearance of such a man—and he is not alone in his denomination—is a cheering sign of the times. It remains, however, to be shown, whether his denomination will tolerate such freedom of thought and speech as he claims to exercise. To him it is of no consequence how they decide, but of much to themselves.

-
- 10.—*The Gospel of To-day*: a Discourse delivered at the Ordination of T. W. Higginson as Minister of the First Religious Society in Newburyport, Mass., Sept. 15th, 1847, by WILLIAM HENRY CHANNING; together with the Charge, Right-hand of Fellowship, and Address to the People. Boston. 1847. pp. 64.

MR. Channing says, "Infinite love is the primal source of life; oneness with God and good spirits the real immortality; disinterestedness the sufficing joy; goodness the only way to heaven," but still the peculiar signs of the times require a "gospel for to-day" as well as for ever. All the tendencies of the age converge to one end. The tendencies of Piety are revivalism, naturalism, catholicism; of Philanthropy, social reforms, educational plans, and religious charities; of Politics, liberalism, legitimacy, political economy. "The whole age is sweeping onward towards the era of combined order." And in the very thought of that—"of society organized according to divine law—is revealed a prophecy of unspeakable grandeur." All things point towards perfect society. He does not describe perfect society, but announces "four fundamental Truths, the corner-stones of this Temple of Unity;" namely, 'God is Love;' 'Nature is the symbol of the Eternal Being;' 'Humanity is one—one in its physical, social, spiritual life.' 'The Law of order for humanity, among all nations, within each nation, between individuals, is, once and for ever, Love.' The anticipation of perfect society is not visionary; this appears from the character of God, from man's modes of existence—psychical, social, spiritual—and his position between nature below and heaven above. All things are leading us onward to "oneness with man, with nature, and with God." The discourse is marked by the well-known characteristics of the distinguished author; by human-

ity, piety, by rare and beautiful eloquence. The other addresses are likewise of a high order, and entirely free from bigotry and sectarianism. Mr. Higginson—like his ancestor in 1629, the first minister ordained in New England—was ordained without help or hindrance from any “ecclesiastical council.”

-
11. — *Modern Painters*. Third Edition. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1846. 2 vols. imp. 8vo. pp. 422 and 217. (The first volume reprinted by Wiley & Putnam. New York. 1847.)

WE hope to be able at some future time to lay before our readers an extended examination of this remarkable book. Meanwhile, a mere passing notice might seem superfluous, as it appears to have already made its own way. Nevertheless, as this work seems to us not less important to the unartistic lover of Nature than to the painter or connoisseur—and as these sheets may perchance fall into the hands of some one who has not heard it praised,—we cannot refrain from making a few extracts.

This book, which at present consists of two volumes, but of which we are promised a third volume, with illustrations, originated, as the preface tells us, “in indignation at the shallow and false criticism of the periodicals of the day on the works of the great living artist [J. M. W. Turner] to whom it principally refers.” Its purpose “is to demonstrate the utter falseness both of the facts and principles, the imperfection of material, and error of arrangement,” on which the so-called “ideal” landscapes of the old painters are based; “and to insist on the necessity, as well as the dignity, of an earnest, faithful, living, study of Nature as she is, rejecting with abhorrence all that man has ever done to alter and modify her.” The old landscapists, he thinks, “had neither love of Nature, nor feeling of her beauty; they looked for her coldest and most commonplace effects, because they were easiest to imitate;” “the deception of the senses was the great and first end of all their art.” The modern English painters, on the contrary, and particularly Turner, according to him, “have looked at Nature with totally different eyes; seeking not for what is easiest to imitate, but for what is most important to tell.”

Whether Mr. Turner and his countrymen deserve the high relative rank here given them, we have in this country few facilities for judging: probably few will admit the justice of all he says on this point, and we may trace here, perhaps, some injurious effects of the circumstances under which the book, or at least the first part of it, was written.

But this we conceive to be altogether a minor question. The

main point is, whether there is any thing in Nature capable and worthy of representation, which the old painters did not represent. This question can be discussed as well, perhaps, in this country, as anywhere: for, on the one hand, Nature, with all her variety, has but one system, and produces all her effects by the same means; and on the other, though much of the spirit of a picture is lost in a print, yet enough usually remains to show its general character and aim — enough, therefore, to enable us to apprehend a fundamental difference of plan, if it exist, though not to judge of its execution. Now, how much soever we may admire Claude's or Ruysdael's landscapes, this, at least, we must admit — that they portray something very *different* from what we know of actual Nature. And this is not merely the superficial difference of scene and climate, but a difference of *aim* in the painter. Nobody expects to find in the galleries of Rome or Dresden any thing reminding him of New England. Yet we are reminded of New England, and of what might seem the most local and peculiar effects and details of its landscape, on almost every page of our author's first volume, though he treats exclusively of European scenery. The difference, therefore, arises not from any foreignness of the objects represented, but of the sentiment with which they were viewed. This may be higher or lower; it is at least radically different. "I am not speaking," he says, "of the beauty or desirableness of the system of the old masters; it may be sublime, and affecting, and ideal, and intellectual, and a great deal more; but all I am concerned with at present is, that it is not *true*." "A man accustomed to the broad, wild sea-shore, with its bright breakers, and free winds, and sounding rocks, and eternal sensation of tameless power, can scarcely but be angered when Claude bids him stand still on some paltry, chipped, and chiselled quay, with porters and wheelbarrows running against him, to watch a weak, rippling, bound, and barriered water, that has not strength enough in one of its waves to upset the flower-pots on the wall, or even fling a jet of spray over the confining stone." "Nor is it only by the professed landscape painters that the great verities of the material world are betrayed. Grand as are the motives of landscape in the works of the earlier and mightier men, there is yet in them nothing approaching to a general view, nor complete rendering of natural phenomena; — not that they are to be blamed for this; for they took out of nature that which was fit for their purpose, and their mission was to do no more; but we must be cautious to distinguish that imaginative abstraction of landscape which alone we find in them, from the entire statement of truth which has been attempted by the moderns." "From the window of Titian's house at Venice, the chain of the Tyrolese Alps is seen lifted in spectral power above the tufted plain of Treviso; every dawn that reddens the towers of Murano lights also a line of pyramidal

fires along that colossal ridge ; but there is, so far as I know, no evidence in any of the master's works of his ever having beheld, much less felt, the majesty of their burning." "More than this, of that which they loved and rendered, much is rendered conventionally : by noble conventionalities, indeed, but such, nevertheless, as would be inexcusable if the landscape became the principal subject instead of an accompaniment." And whether this difference of aim be attributed to inability, or to intentional limitation, the reason is, we think, in either case the same ; namely, that there now exists a more profound appreciation of the landscape, by itself, without any adventitious interest, than formerly. The only alternative is to suppose that what we feel in the landscape is *beyond the reach* of pictorial art ; — that the old painters felt it also, but wisely abstained from attempting impossibilities. This opinion is a common one, and is supported by the conservative instinct which everywhere holds by what has been done, and refuses to admit the possibility of any thing better. And so far the feeling is just : — we are not called upon to take possibilities for facts, or to believe that any thing *can be* until it is. But it is to be remembered, on the other hand, that every great action, as has been said, is an impossibility until it is done : — and that if we quit our skepticism, and say positively that it is impossible for modern art to excel the ancient, we ought to show some ground for our assertion in the nature of things.

That there are feelings which cannot be thus expressed, all will allow ; — but that what Nature does every day by means which we can imitate, though at a vast interval, cannot be represented, even at such an interval, by pictorial art — remains to be proved. If authority is to govern, we on our part might well rely on the authority of the "Oxford Graduate." He shows such a profound instinct for principles ; such a subtle apprehension and such an unwearyed study of detail, in the work before us, as it is utterly impossible to give any adequate idea of by quotations admissible within our limits, but which is in our opinion unapproached in the language. All we knew we find here, and a great deal more. His statements therefore have a great deal of internal evidence in their favor ; — it is natural to suppose that his standard is as high and his appreciation as just, in Art as in Nature.

But there are independent grounds, we think, in facts acknowledged by all, for believing that landscape by itself, that is, material nature, was less interesting and important to mankind in general, and therefore likely to be less profoundly understood and felt by artists in former times, than now.

In the works of the old painters the interest is less in the landscape itself, than in its connection with or adaptation to man. Trees, rocks, earth, and water were to them mere rubbish, of which they were to *make* a picture. These commonplace details were

to be elevated and idealized as being accessory to an historical subject; or even where they apparently stand by themselves, they always suppose some spectator present either in or out of the picture, since they are arranged with an evident view to striking at first sight some beholder. In the earlier landscape, the foreground is filled with animals, birds, and even insects and reptiles, — which no peasant could pass without observing; later, the object of attention is more elevated, but still something extraneous to the landscape. Even Claude never omits at least the glimpse of a city or castle, nor Ruysdael his distant spire.

In *tone*, that is, such a gradation of light and color as shall make the picture agreeable and intelligible at first sight, our author allows that the old masters are unequalled, but this effect, according to him, they obtained at the sacrifice of more important truth. They imitated accurately the relation and positive quantity of light and color in certain parts of the landscape, but from the inferiority of the means employed to those of Nature they soon came to the end of their scale, and were obliged "to omit the truths of space in every individual part of their picture, by the thousand. But this they did not care for; it saved them trouble; they reached their grand end, imitative effect; they thrust home just at the places where the common and careless eye looks for imitation, and they attained the broadest and most faithful appearance of truth of tone which art can exhibit."

This so-called "idealizing" of landscape, whatever may be thought of it, at all events implies at least the omission, if not the falsification, of a large part of the objects and aspects of Nature. When we select, we must neglect something. Now to *idealize* ought to mean, to seize the idea common to a variety of details, and, sufficiently expressing it, to neglect what is mere repetition, accident, or imperfection. "The true ideal of landscape," therefore, "is the expression of the specific—not the individual, but the specific—characters of every object, in their perfection." Any thing unworthy of being represented, therefore, must be something which does not, in Nature, express any idea.

Now it may be doubted, we think, whether *any thing* in Nature (as distinct from man) was felt by the old painters to be of itself the expression of an idea. Certain forms and effects of color and tone they admired; and they admired the landscape just so far as it could be made to conform to their preconceived notions. We are inclined to think, with our author, that the *idealization* of the landscape by the celebrated painters of former times, was too often a mere fanciful distortion of Nature, to suit the whim of the artist.

These views are supported by the feeling now common to all lovers of Nature, that the beauty of the landscape is a pervading quality, common to all landscapes: infinitely various, indeed, in degree, yet independent of any special assignable characters. The

charm of our autumn woods and fields is totally unconnected, not only with all human interest, but also with any striking details. It is not felt only, nor most forcibly, in presence of wide or enriched prospects, of majestic mountains and waterfalls—but of some familiar scene, in which all the features are commonplace, but exalted by some happy effect of light. The scanty range of a lonely brush-pasture in an autumn afternoon—the echoing stillness of a hemlock grove in winter—a few junipers and barberry-bushes, or the details of a mossy rock in the haze of spring—are sufficient for the highest enjoyment that can be derived from Nature. This enjoyment is distinct in kind from the admiration of remarkable natural objects, and their representation by the old painters; it is a veneration and love for the total spirit of Nature, and not for selected features. Our limits would not permit any satisfactory illustration or discussion of this novel and abstruse subject; we must refer those interested in the matter to our author's pages. We may remark, however, that this difference of feeling towards Nature between ancient and modern times, is not confined to Art, but is seen also in Science and Religion. The Greeks did not believe that the gods *created* the world, but only that they governed it; their power was a power *over* Nature, as something apart, and originally independent of them. And even after the Christian era, there was nothing like a *science* of nature. Natural Philosophy in the time of Leonardo da Vinci was either Mechanics, the art of managing the forces of Nature, or Alchemy, the art of juggling with them; Nature being looked upon as mere dead matter, or as the creation and kingdom of the devil.

“I know not,” says our author, “that of the expressions of affection towards external nature to be found among Heathen writers, there are any of which the balance and leading thought cleaves not towards the sensual parts of her. Her beneficence they sought, and her power they shunned; her teaching through both, they understood never. The pleasant influences of soft winds, and ringing streamlets, and shady coverts; of the violet couch, and plane-tree shade, they received, perhaps, in a more noble way than we, but they found not any thing except fear, upon the bare mountain, or in the ghostly glen. The Hybla heather they loved more for its sweet hives than its purple hues. But the Christian spirit . . . finds the object of its love everywhere, in what is harsh and peaceful, as well as what is kind; nay, even in all that seems coarse and commonplace, seizing that which is good, and delighting more sometimes at finding its table spread in strange places, and in the presence of its enemies, and its honey coming out of the rock, than if all were harmonized into a less wondrous pleasure.”

If, then, there now exists a keener sense for Nature than formerly, it will follow that the aim of painters of landscape of the present day *ought* to be, and very naturally may be, higher than

that of their predecessors ; and this, as already remarked, is the important point. Our author, however, goes further than this, and endeavours to show, in a detailed dissection of the landscape in Nature and in existing pictures, which occupies the principal part of his first volume, the actual superiority of the moderns. Whatever may be thought of this opinion, this part of the book will probably be the most popular, from the keen observation and appreciation of Nature which it displays. Should we undertake to quote here, it would be difficult to know when to stop, and we can only recommend every lover of the country to buy it and read for himself. The second volume contains discussions of general principles of *Æsthetics*, which, though resting rather upon instinctive feeling than systematic knowledge, are yet in the highest degree interesting and valuable. In this volume also are many keen criticisms of particular works of art.

The American reprint is very neatly executed, and with tolerable correctness, — but we hope the publishers do not intend to put us off with half the work instead of the whole. We are sorry to see no indications on the cover or title-page, that this is only the first volume.

12. — *De l'Esclavage et des Colonies.* Par GUSTAVE DU PUY-NODE, docteur en droit, avocat à la cour royale de Paris. Paris. 1847. 8vo. pp. xvi and 224.

THIS is the third work of the author on the same or a similar subject. In 1845 he published a work on labor and the laboring classes. In the first two chapters he treats of slavery. He says, Liberty for all men, and in all departments of life, is the hope of the age. The two great problems of France are — to found a new order of things in Algiers, and in the West Indies to restore the slaves to the condition of entire civil and social freedom. He will not “undertake to prove the iniquity of slavery. The time has gone by when it was necessary to demonstrate that the color of the skin, or the place of birth, ought not to determine a man's rank in society.” It must be remembered he is writing at Paris. “Slavery is a crime and a blunder. The solidarity of mankind was taught fully by the Stoics, and by Christianity, but has not been understood till now. France has taken the lead in developing the doctrine, and ought to abolish slavery, for she will thereby influence other nations, and slavery is at this day the greatest obstacle in the way of civilization. It perverts the master and debases the slave ; it dishonors labor, renders it unproductive, corrupts the wealthy and promotes the vices of the poor. It is only possible on condition that the slaves are degraded, and the masters tyrants.” To show that slavery prevents the increase

of population, he cites Mr. Clay, "one of the most enlightened men of the Union, and one of the most ardent defenders of slavery."

In 1315, Louis the Tenth made all men free who touched the soil of France, but Louis the Thirteenth introduced slavery into the French colonies. Formerly the Spanish slaves were better treated than others, but now, in point of cruelty, "Spanish slavery can only be compared to the American." He thinks the revolts and escapes show that the slaves are not happy, and quotes Mr. Humboldt, who says he has studied their condition where the laws and national habits tend to ameliorate their lot, but goes back with the same horror of slavery as when he first quitted Europe.

It seems the American churches are not alone in their defence of the "patriarchal institution," for the seminary of *Saint Esprit*, in which most of the colonial clergy are educated for their functions, teaches the legitimacy of slavery and the slave-trade; "the religion of a nation seldom prevails over its interests," says Humboldt. "It is the philosophers, not the devotees, who agitate the question of slavery." He thinks emancipation works well in the British West Indies: the blacks have money in the savings bank; they join temperance societies, build churches, and fill them; they send money to the London Abolition Society, to promote their work; they send missionaries to Africa to preach Love and Liberty on their natal soil; crime decreases from year to year. He says there are three schemes of emancipation: 1. gradual and progressive; 2. general and graduated; 3. general and spontaneous. He recommends general and immediate emancipation.

In Chapter III. he gives a history of ancient colonization, by the Greeks, Romans, and Phœnicians; in Chapter IV. he proposes a reform of the French colonies; in Chapter V. he touches upon the condition of Algiers.

13. — *Evangeline, a Tale of Acadie.* By HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW. Third Edition. Boston: Wm. D. Ticknor & Co. 1848. 16mo. pp. 163.

THIS is a beautiful poem in Hexameter verse, and relates the adventures of a young French maiden — Evangeline — a native of Acadie. The English destroy the French settlement of Grand Pré, and carry off the inhabitants, who are scattered over the continent. Evangeline gets separated from her lover, Gabriel, and after seeking him in all the French settlements, from the great lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, becomes a sister of charity in Philadelphia. She discovers him in a hospital, sick, and too feeble to speak. He dies in her arms, and she soon joins him in the world where there is no separation.

The poem is full of beauties — now of description, or of senti-

ment, and occasionally of thought. The rhythmic movement is generally slight, but sometimes more emphatic, and sometimes sinking almost to prose. The measure seems wholly congenial to the author's mind; the sound "an echo to the sense." We give a few specimens.

"Many a farewell word and sweet goodnight on the door-step
Lingered long in Evangeline's heart, and filled it with gladness.
Carefully then were covered the embers that glowed on the hearthstone,
And on the oaken stairs resounded the tread of the farmer.
Soon with a soundless step the foot of Evangeline followed.
Up the staircase moved a luminous space in the darkness,
Lighted less by the lamp than the shining face [form?] of the maiden." — p. 46.

"Friends they sought and homes; and many despairing, heart-broken,
Asked of the earth but a grave, and no longer a friend or a fireside.
Written their history stands on tablets of stone in the churchyard,
Long among them was seen a maiden who waited and wandered,
Lowly and meek in spirit and patiently suffering all things.
Fair was she and young; but, alas! before her extended,
Dreary and vast and silent the desert of life, with its pathway
Marked by the graves of those who had sorrowed and fallen before her,
Passions long extinguished, and hopes long dead and abandoned,
As the emigrant's way o'er the Western desert is marked by
Camp-fires long consumed, and bones that bleach in the sunshine.
Something there was in her life incomplete, imperfect, unfinished;
As if a morning of June, with all its music and sunshine,
Suddenly paused in the sky, and, fading, slowly descended
Into the East again, from whence it late had arisen.
Sometimes she lingered in towns, till, urged by the fever within her,
Urged by a restless longing, the hunger and thirst of the spirit,
She would commence again her endless search and endeavour;
Sometimes in churchyards strayed and gazed on the crosses and tombstones,
Sat by some nameless grave, and thought that perhaps in its bosom
He was already at rest, and she longed to slumber beside him." — p. 84 - 86.

"STILL stands the forest primeval; but far away from its shadow,
Side by side, in their nameless graves, the lovers are sleeping,
Under the humble walls of the little Catholic churchyard,
In the heart of the city, they lie, unknown and unnoticed.
Daily the tides of life go ebbing and flowing beside them,
Thousands of throbbing hearts, where theirs are at rest and for ever,
Thousands of aching brains, where theirs no longer are busy,
Thousands of toiling hands, where theirs have ceased from their labors,
Thousands of weary feet, where theirs have completed the journey." — pp.
161, 162.

We would only remind the author that the chestnut-tree does not grow in Acadie, that hoop-tire was not known among its inhabitants, and that no orchard is found "bending with golden fruit," in that region, in the month of November. American readers may well thank the author for a poem so wholly American in its incidents, its geography, and its scenery. We cannot but think it will add to the well-earned fame of its accomplished author. It has reached three editions in a few days, and we trust will soon reach many more.

14. — *Essays by R. W. Emerson. First Series. New Edition.* Boston: James Munroe & Company. 1847. pp. vi and 333. 12mo.

THIS new edition contains some poetic matters not in the earlier impression.

15. — *The Principles of Nature and her divine Revelations, and a Voice to Mankind by and through Andrew Jackson Davis, "the Poughkeepsie Seer" and "clairvoyant."* In three parts. New York. 1847. pp. xxiv and 782.

THIS book consists of three parts. 1. "The Key," containing several remarks on the condition of society in past and present times. 2. "The Revelation," containing an account of the origin and nature of the Universe, including man, and 3. "The Application," which contains an "analysis of society," a statement of its evils, and their remedy. The work treats of many important matters in physical, social, and theological science. If it had appeared as the production of some scholar, writing after much reading and careful study, it would be thought a remarkable production. Very remarkable, considering the variety of matters discussed, the boldness, largeness of mind, and general intelligence displayed therein. Many things in the book are fantastic, many statements incorrect. If it were the work of any man not twenty-one years of age, composed under the most favorable circumstances, it would still be an extraordinary book, perhaps the most extraordinary in the world. But the lectures of which the work is composed were delivered by Mr. Davis while in a state of mesmeric excitement, written down and published from his dictation while in that state. The only alterations made by the scribe were the omission of redundant words, and corrections of false syntax, for Mr. Davis is an uneducated man, who cannot speak his native tongue with common accuracy. What adds to the wonder is, that the author had no acquaintance with literature or science. The editors claim that he had access to the "second sphere of human existence," and there in part obtained his knowledge in a manner not possible except in this state of trance. We see no reason for doubting the integrity of the author or his editors; they may be mistaken. They can hardly be dishonest. Shall we suppose Mr. Davis had read Dr. Lardner's Lectures, the "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation," the works of Swedenborg and Fourier, which have been circulated so extensively and in a form so cheap—and that in the intense excitement of the mesmeric state he reproduced what

he had formerly read, in this strange form, and with additions of his own? Shall it be said that the minds of living men through sympathy *impressed* themselves upon him in that excitement, and he in that manner acquired his information? His editors deny both of these suppositions; they do not claim that he is *infallible*—and there are many and great errors in the book; they claim nothing *miraculous* in his case—only that his ideas came from “the second sphere of human existence.” It is certainly extraordinary that so young a man, with no education, who had never attended any school half a year in his whole life, without acquaintance with scientific works, should dictate so remarkable a work. It must then be referred to the same class with the works of Böhme, Fox, Swedenborg, and the whole host of mystical writers who wrote, more or less, in the state of ecstasy or trance. Very little is known respecting that state, and we hope the appearance of this work, and the frankness and coolness with which its claims are made to so remarkable an origin, will provoke a discussion of the whole matter. Viewed as one will, the book is one of the most remarkable literary curiosities ever heard of.

- 16.— *A Summer in the Wilderness; embracing a Canoe Voyage up the Mississippi and around Lake Superior.* By CHARLES LANMAN, Author of “*Essays for Summer Hours*,” etc. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1847. 16mo. pp. 208.

THE subject of this book is sufficiently explained by the title-page. The ground passed over, it will be seen, is most interesting. We are sorry, however, that Mr. Lanman, in writing his travels, has chosen rather to indulge in general reflections and sentiment, than to bring before his own mind, and thus before his readers, the characteristic features of the country and its inhabitants.

- 17.— *Two Years in the Ministry; or, Farewell Discourses, comprising, 1. Views of the Nature and Sources of true Christian Theology; and 2. Views of the Nature of the Christian Religion, and Salvation by Christ.* By JAMES RICHARDSON, JR., A. M. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1847. 8vo. pp. 58.

THE object of the first of these discourses is to show “the necessity of making Theology an exact science, based upon Reason and Nature, accordant with the facts and realities of the Universe,” and that there is no incompatibility between Religion and Science. The second, on the other hand, guards against the

danger of supposing Religion and Salvation thereby to be "a mere intellectual belief in certain doctrines," and insists "that Religion is wholly a practical matter — a thing of the life."

-
- 18.—*ZENOΦΩΝΤΟΣ ΑΠΟΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ. Zenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates.* With notes by R. D. C. ROBINS, Librarian of Andover Theological Seminary. Andover. 1848. pp. x and 417. 12mo.

IN the text the industrious and accomplished editor has followed mainly the valuable edition of Kühner. The text occupies one hundred and sixty-eight pages. The notes and indices two hundred and forty-seven pages. The text is printed in a neat and clear type. The notes are full and minute, indicating careful and exact study on the editor's part. So far as we have been able to examine them they are accurate and valuable, but rather too full and learned for the use of lads in the lower classes at college, while they contain mere grammatical remarks, which the advanced scholar will not need. However, if this fulness of annotation be an error it is one on the right side. There is an English and a Greek index — both of which are mainly designed to guide the reader to a knowledge of the grammatical peculiarities of the author. This volume, so carefully prepared, is one of the numerous signs of the increased attention paid to the study of the classics.

-
- 19 — *Human Knowledge*: a Discourse delivered before the Massachusetts Alpha of the Phi Beta Kappa Society, at Cambridge, Aug. 26th, 1847. By GEO. P. MARSH. Boston: Little & Brown. 1847. 8vo. pp. 42.

THE subject of Mr. Marsh's address is the position and duties of the American Scholar. "With us," he says, "the pursuit of knowledge is the task of youth, or the recreation of maturity and age, rather than the stated occupation of a class." In contrast with the scanty period usually allotted to its pursuit, he reviews the immense extension of the field of science in our day; the advances made in Philology, Mathematics, Physics, History, Politics, Art, Philosophy, and Theology. In spite of improved methods, "the patrimony of knowledge has now become so wide, that none can hope to possess it in its full extent." We are reminded, however, that knowledge is not a mere aggregate of facts. "It is a mistake to suppose that all mental acquisition implies mental culture. Facts without end may be learned, familiarized, forgotten again, and leave the mind at last more inept than they found it.

The idea, or law, is what is to be learned ;—"pure law is all that is truly knowable, and a knowledge of law brings us to the ultimate possible, as well as the highest and sublimest, limit of human attainment."

Knowledge, however, according to Mr. Marsh, "is but a means to an ultimate end, and therefore should be pursued with constant reference to its higher uses," which are, "not the adaptation of external means to selfish ends," but, "to reign supreme over one's self," and "to promote the best interests of mankind."

As to the prospects of literature in this country, Mr. Marsh thinks that "the American intellect combines the speculative propensities of the German, with the practical tendencies of the English mind,"—and thus sees "in the literature of America abundant promise of rich contributions to the elucidation of the highest themes which can occupy the faculties of mortal man."

* * WE have received prospectuses of two new periodicals, one called "The Nineteenth Century"—to be devoted to "Science, Literature, National News, Reform theories of Government and Law, and Religion without sectarianism. To be edited by C. C. Burr, and published by G. B. Zieber & Co., Philadelphia." Among the names of promised contributors we notice those of Horace Greeley and Mr. Furness.

The other is to bear the title of "The Univercœlum," and "to be devoted to General Inquiry, Philosophies, Theology, and the inculcation of the principles of Nature, in their application to individual and social life." It is to be conducted and published by "S. B. Brittan, of New York, assisted by twelve associate editors," among whom is Mr. Davis, "The Poughkeepsie Seer."

RECENT PUBLICATIONS IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

- G. Phillips: Ueb. d. Ordalien bei d. Germanen. Münch. 1847. 4to. pp. 15.
 B. G. Niebuhr: Histor. u. philolog. Vorträge. 2te Abth. 1r B. D. Orient bis zur Schlacht bei Salamis. Griechenland bis auf Perikles. Berlin. 1847. 8vo. pp. 475.
 G. H. Pertz: J. Grimm: H. Lachmann: L. Ranke: u. H. Ritter: D. Geschichtschreiber d. deutsch. Vorzeit, in e. deutschen Bearbeitung. 1r Bd. 1r Hälfte. Berlin. 1847.
 G. G. Gervinus: D. Preuss. Verfassung u. d. Patent v. 3. Feb. 1847. Mannheim. 1847. 8vo. pp. 127.
 J. G. v. Herder: Lebensbild. Sein chronologisch-geordneter Briefwechsel, &c. Herausg. v. s. Sohne. 3r Bd. Erlangen. 1847.
 A. Sanguineti: Vita di Cristoforo Colombo. Genova. 1846.
 C. Reta: The Same. Torino. 1846.
 J. D. W. Sachse: Verzeichniss v. Bildnissen v. Aerzten u. Naturforschern seit d. ält. bis auf uns. Zeiten, mit Biographien. 1s. Heft. Abano—D'Azzogujoi, Schwerin. 1847. 8vo. pp. vi u. 93.
 H. Viehoff: Goethe's Leben. 1r Th. pp. 400 u. G's. Portr. Stuttgart. 1847. gr. 16.
 K. O. Müller: Kleine Schriften: 1r Bd., nebst Erinnerungen a. d. Leben d. Verf. 1 Karte. Breslau. 1847. 8vo. pp. LXXXVII u. 550.
 K. Varnhagen von Ense: Denkwürdigkeiten. Neue Folge. Leipzig. 1847.
 Schiller's u. Fichte's Briefwechsel, a. d. Nachl. d. Ersten herausg. v. J. H. Fichte. Berlin. 1847. 8vo. pp. 75, u. 1 Facsimile.

NATURAL SCIENCES.

- H. M. Ducrotay de Blainville: Osteographie, ou descript. iconograph. comparée du squelette et du système dentaire des cinq classes d'animaux vertébrés recens et fossiles. Paris. 1847. pp. 246. 4to et 15 planches fol.
 O. Des-Murs: Iconographie ornithologique, pour servir de suite et de complément aux Pl. enluminées de Buffon, et aux Pl. colorées de Temminck, &c. dessinées par A. Prevot et Oudard. 7 et 8 Livr. Paris. 1847. imp. 4to. 12 pl. et 48 pp. texte.
 J. Müller: Ueb. d. bisher unbekannten typischen Verschiedenheiten d. Stimmorgane d. Passerinen. Mit 6 Kupf. Berlin. 1847. 4to. pp. 74.
 J. J. v. Tschudi: Untersuch. üb. d. Fauna Peruana. (Schluss.) St. Gallen. 1847. imp. 4to.
 C. F. Gauss: Untersuch. üb. Gegenstände d. höh. Geodäsie. Göttingen. 1847. 4to. pp. 43.
 E. Desor: Agassiz u. s. Freunde geolog. Alpenreisen. Unter Agassiz' Studer's u. C. Vogt's Mitwirkung verf. v. E. Desor. 2te Aufl. Herausg. v. C. Vogt. Frankfurt a. M. 1847. 8vo. pp. XXXVI u. 672. Mit 4 Karten.
 Rud. Wagner: Neue Untersuch. üb. d. Bau u. d. Endigung d. Nerven, u. d. Struktur d. Ganglien. Supp. zu d. Icones physiologicae. 1 Kupf. Leipzig. 1847. fol. pp. 18.
 Rud. Wagner: Lehrbuch d. Zootomie. 2te umgearb. Aufl. Ebend. 1847. 2 Thl. pp. 320 und 642.
 v. Siebold: u. Stannius: Lehrb. d. vergl. Anatomie. Berlin. 1847.
 M. Sars. Fauna littoralis Norvegiæ, od. Beschreib. u. Abbild. neuer oder wenig bekannter Seethiere, etc. 1r Hft. Christiania. 1847. fol. pp. 100 and 10 Taf.
 J. H. Mädler: D. Centralsonne. 2te umg. Aufl. Mitau. 1847. 8vo. pp. 78.

H. F. Link: *Anat. d. Pflanzen in Abbildungen.* 3s. H. 12 lith. Taf. Berlin. 1847. 4to. pp. 10.

J. Liebig: *Thier-Chemie: 3e umg. u. sehr verm. Aufl.* 1r. Abth. Braunsch. 1847. 8vo. pp. xvi u. 231.

H. W. Dove: *Ueb. d. nicht period. Aenderungen d. Temperaturvertheilung a. d. Oberfl. d. Erde v. 1729 bis 1843.* Berlin. 1847. 4to. pp. 183.

J. J. S. Steenstrup: *Untersuch. üb. d. Vorkommen d. Hermaphroditismus in d. Natur.* A. d. Däns. v. C. J. Hornschuch. Greifswald. 1847. 2 Taf. 4to. pp. 72.

PHILOSOPHY.

P. Galluppi: *Saggio filosofico sulla critica della conoscenza, ossia analisi del pensiero umano, con un esame delle piu importanti questioni della ideologia, del Kantismo, et della filosofia transcendente.* V. I—IV. Milano. 12 l.

G. Bianchetti: *Della Scienza, colla giunta di alcuni discorsi dello stesso autore.* Venezia. 5 l.

J. J. Arbolí: *Compendio de las lecciones de filosofia, que enseñan en el colegio de humanidades da S. Fel. Neri de Cadix.* T. I—III. Cadix. 1847. 6 frs.

P. Bottura: *Trattato delle passioni.* Venezia. 1847.

P. Pas. Deani: *Orazioni panegiriche.* Milano. 1847. 12 1-2 l.

Chr. Bartholmess: *Jordano Bruno.* Paris. 1847. 2 vol. 15 frs.

E. Catalan: *Etudes sur Montaigne: Analyse de sa philosophie.* Paris. 1847. 3 1-2 frs.

C. M. P. Petrelli: *Om Menniskosjälens Natur.* Linköp. 1847.

H. Ritter: *Ueber k. Emanationslehre im Uebergange a. d. alterthüml. in d. christl. Denkweise.* Göttingen. 1847. 4to. pp. 40.

A. Schwegler: *D. Metaphysik d. Aristoteles.* Grundtext, Uebers, u. Erläut. Tübingen. 1846.

K. Rosenkranz: *D. Modification, d. Logik.* Leipzig. 1846.

K. Rosenkranz: *Studien.* Thl. II. Leipzig. 1847.

E. L. Michelet: *D. Epiphanie d. ewig. Persönlichkeit d. Geistes.* 2te Gespr. D. historische Christus u. d. neuere Christenthum. Darmstadt. 1847. 8vo. pp. 256.

J. Böhme: *Sämmtl. Werke, herausg. v. K. W. Schiebler, 1—7r B.* Leipzig. 1847.

J. G. Fichte: *Sämmtl. Werke, 9r—11r Bd.* Bonn. 1847.

G. C. Lichtenberg: *Vermischte Schriften, 8r B.* Göttingen. 1847. 16mo. pp. 344.

P. Marheineke: *Theolog. Vorlesungen.* Herausg. v. S. Mattheis u. W. Vatke. 1r Bd. *System d. theol. Moral.* Berlin. 1847. 8vo. pp. xxx u. 641.

B. Spinoza: *Op. quæ sup. omnia.* Ed. C. H. Bruder. V. III. Leipzig. 1846.

W. v. Humboldt: *Sämmtl. Werke.* Berlin. 1847.

J. Willm: *Histoire de la Philosophie Allemande depuis Kant jusqu'à Hegel.* Ouvrage couronné par l'Institut. Paris. Vol. I., 1846. Vol. II., 1847. 8vo.

LAW.

K. v. Savigny: *System d. heut. Röm. Rechts.* B. 6. Berlin. 1847.

GENERAL LITERATURE, ART, ETC.

Fr. Kugler: *Handb. d. Gesch. d. Malerei s. Constantin d. Grossen.* 2te umg. Aufl. Berlin. 1847.

P. Asbjörnsen: u. J. Moe: *Norwegische Volksmärchen.* Uebers. v. Breseman, mit Vorw. v. L. Tieck. Berlin. 1847. 2 Bde.

1847.] *Recent Publications in Continental Europe.* 143

G. K. Nagler: Neues allgem. Künstler-Lexicon. 16r Bd. 3e—6e Lfg. (Secante—Sole.) Münch. 1847. 8vo. pp. 193—572.

A. W. v. Schlegel: Sämmtl. Werke. Herausg. v. E. Böcking. 11r B. Leipz. 1847. 8vo. pp. 430.

Fr. v. Schlegel: Sämmtl. Werke. 14r und 15r Bd. (Schluss.) Wien. 1847. 8vo.

G. F. Benecke: Mittlehochdeutsches Wörterbuch. A. s. Nachlass herausg. v. Dr. W. Müller. 1r B. 1r Lfg. Leipz. 1847.

L'Orlando furioso di Lud. Ariosto, con illustr. storiche e romanische, e 100 incisivi. Firenze. 1844—6.

The Same. Preced. d'alcuni pensieri, di V. Geoberti. Firenze. 1846. 2 vol.

Biblioteca de autores españoles desde la formacion del lenguaje, hasta nuestros dias, B. C. Auban. T. 1o. Obras de M. de Cervantes Saavedra: T. 2o. Obras de N. y. d. L. F. de Moratin: T. 3o. Novellas anteriores a Cervantes. Madrid, (Leipzig, Brockh. y Avenarius.) 1846.

Le Opere di Galileo Galilei: prima edizione completa. Firenze. 1845.